



NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL Monterey, California



THESIS

MILITARY HEALTH CARE SYSTEM: COMPARING OBSTETRICS COSTS BETWEEN A MILITARY TREATMENT FACILITY AND CHAMPUS

by

Julito Pedrozo Laluan

September, 1991

Thesis Advisor:

Dr. Dan Trietsch

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

T257830



The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S.

For more than three decades, two systems or programs have provided health care for military beneficiaries: (1) the direct care system, whereby beneficiaries obtain health care services from military treatment facilities (MTFs), and (2) CHAMPUS (Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services), a health program in which beneficiaries receive care from civilian facilities. The high cost to DoD of supplying inexpensive medical care, as well as concern over timeliness of service, has prompted many suggestions for reforming the military health care system. Based on the above, the objective of this research is to compare costs between a military treatment facility and CHAMPUS and to determine whether a given MTF can provide inpatient care to its beneficiaries at lower cost than through CHAMPUS. By comparing MTF and CHAMPUS costs, a given MTF can identify those specialty areas in which to reduce costs either by increasing workload (use of recapture and/or normal increase of appointments) or increasing referrals to outside health care providers.

20 DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT	21 ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	
X UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED SAME AS REPORT DTIC USERS	Unclassified	
22a NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL	22b TELEPHONE (Include Area code)	22c OFFICE SYMBOL
Dr. Dan Trietsch	408-646-2456	AS/TR

DD FORM 1473, 84 MAR

83 APR edition may be used until exhausted All other editions are obsolete

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

Unclassified

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Military Health Care System: Comparing Obstetrics Costs Between A Military
Treatment Facility And CHAMPUS

by

Julito P. Laluan
Lieutenant, United States Navy

B.S., University of the State of New York, Albany, 1978

M.A., National University, San Diego, 1987

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL , September 1991 /

ABSTRACT

For more than three decades, two systems or programs have provided health care for military beneficiaries: (1) the direct care system, whereby beneficiaries obtain health care services from military treatment facilities (MTFs), and (2) CHAMPUS (Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services), a health program in which beneficiaries receive care from civilian facilities. The high cost to DoD of supplying inexpensive medical care, as well as concern over timeliness of service, has prompted many suggestions for reforming the military health care system. Based on the above, the objective of this research is to compare costs between a military treatment facility and CHAMPUS and to determine whether a given MTF can provide inpatient care to its beneficiaries at lower cost than through CHAMPUS. By comparing MTF and CHAMPUS costs, a given MTF can identify those specialty areas in which to reduce costs either by increasing workload (use of recapture and/or normal increase of appointments) or increasing referrals to outside health care providers.

TACETY ZACONE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTE	RODUCTION	1
	A.	BACKGROUND	1
	в.	OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH	2
	C.	RESEARCH QUESTION	3
	D.	SCOPE	4
	E.	METHODOLOGY	5
II.	THE	E MILITARY HEALTH CARE	6
	A.	OVERVIEW	6
	в.	THE MILITARY HEALTH CARE SYSTEM AND ITS	
		PROBLEMS	6
	C.	UNDERSTANDING MILITARY HEALTH CARE	7
	D.	ACTIVE DUTY DEPENDENTS	8
	E.	RETIREES' AND THEIR DEPENDENTS	9
	F.	OTHER HEALTH CARE SERVICES	. 0
III.	. TH	HE CHAMPUS PROGRAM	.2
	A.	BACKGROUND	.2
	В.	THE CHAMPUS PROGRAM AND ITS PROBLEMS 1	.2
	C.	HOW CHAMPUS PROGRAM WORKS	.3
	D.	THE CHAMPUS REFORM INITIATIVE	.5

IV.	ME	THODOLOGY	•	• •	•	٠	٠	٠	٠	•	17
	A.	SOURCES OF DATA	•						•		17
	в.	OVERVIEW OF MEPRS	•		•		•	•	•	•	17
	C.	CALCULATING COSTS USING P.	ΑT	IEN	Т	7	re	IA:	ME	ENT	
		PROTOCOLS	•		•	•	•	•		•	20
	D.	MEPRS DATA	•		•	•	•			•	20
	E.	CHAMPUS COST DATA	•			•	•		•		22
	F.	METHODOLOGY APPLICATION	•		•	•	•		•	•	22
v.	DIS	CUSSION AND ANALYSIS	•		•	•	•	•	٠	•	25
	A.	CHAPTER OVERVIEW	•		•	•	•			•	25
	в.	ANALYSIS	•		•	•	•			•	26
VI.	COI	NCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	•		•		•			•	32
	Α.	CONCLUSIONS	•		•	•	•			•	32
	в.	RECOMMENDATIONS	•		•		•			•	34
APP:	ENDI	X A (PERFORMANCE DESCRIPTIONS)	•		•		•	•		•	36
APP	ENDI	X B (OCCUPIED BED DAY DATA) .	•				•	•		•	37
APP	ENDI	X C (DIRECT EXPENSE REPORT) .	•		٠	•	•	•	•	•	38
APP:	ENDI:	X D (STEPDOWN SCHEDULE)	•		•	•			•	•	39
APP	ENDI	X E (FINAL PURIFICATION REPORT)									42

APPENDIX F	(COMPUTATION SUMMARY)	• •	• •	•	• •	•	43
APPENDIX G	(INPATIENT NAS REPOR	т)				• •	•	44
APPENDIX H	(HEALTH CARE SUMMARY)				• •	•	61
APPENDIX I	(SUMMARY OF COSTS/WO	RKLOAD)						65
APPENDIX J	(INPATIENT SPECIALTY)			•		•	66
APPENDIX K	(GLOSSARY)				•		•	67
LIST OF RE	FERENCES				•	• •	•	68
INITIAL DI	STRIBUTION LIST							69

I. INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND

Champus is the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services, a Department of Defense program for reimbursing individuals and health care providers for services provided for eligible beneficiaries and retirees. It picks up most of the costs for treatment in civilian medical facilities when military hospitals and clinics are too distant or busy. Basically, the dependents of active-duty members, retirees and their dependents under 65, some former spouses of service members, and certain survivors can use CHAMPUS. So may the families of reserve and National Guard members called to active duty. After paying an annual deductible, beneficiaries of active duty members are responsible for 20% of allowable charges for outpatient care and a small daily fee or \$25.00 whichever is higher for inpatient care. Additionally, beneficiaries of retirees pay 25% for outpatient and inpatient care (after paying an annual deductible). However, some people are not eligible for CHAMPUS, such as active-duty military, parents, parents-in-law, and most persons eligible for Medicare hospitalization insurance. [Ref. 1:pp. 11-14]

For the past decade, the CHAMPUS budget has grown substantially as a result of several factors. First, the

Department of Defense has expanded in size significantly, resulting in a greater number of military personnel whose medical care is the responsibility of the military. Second, there is a rise in total national health care expenditures [Ref. 2:p. I-3,5]. These costs have grown excessively when compared to the acceptable level of inflation, as both personnel costs and technology related with health care services have increased. Also, there is a substantial number of service personnel entering the military with dependents compared to previous years. These additional dependents, especially children, have a tremendous need for medical services. Consequently, this need for health care far exceeds the capacity of overburdened military facilities.

B. OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH

For more than three decades, two systems have provided health care for U.S. military beneficiaries: (1) the direct care system, whereby beneficiaries obtain health care services from military treatment facilities (MTF's), and (2) CHAMPUS (Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services), a health program in which eligible beneficiaries receive care from civilian facilities. [Ref. 9:p. v)

The Department of Defense (DoD) now spends approximately \$5 billion a year on medical services. About \$4 billion of this spending covers most of the military treatment facilities (MTF). The cost to DoD of supplying inexpensive medical care,

as well as concern over timeliness of service, has prompted many suggestions for reforming the military health care system.

For the past 10 years, CHAMPUS costs have increased significantly. Inspite of the higher costs, CHAMPUS is not adequate nor fully acceptable because of its coverage limitations, high out-of-pocket costs compared to other forms of insurance, and program complexity. [Ref. 3:p. 1]

Based on the above, the objective of this research is to compare MTF and CHAMPUS costs and to determine whether a given MTF can provide inpatient care to its beneficiaries at lower cost than through CHAMPUS. The analysis provides a method of calculating MTF specialty cost per admission that can be compared to the equivalent specialty cost reported by CHAMPUS.

C. RESEARCH QUESTION

The primary question of the thesis is: Can we use inpatient treatment protocols as a basis or methodology for comparing costs between CHAMPUS and an MTF.

A subsidiary question is:

1. Will it be cost-effective to treat beneficiaries in military treatment facilities?

D. SCOPE

This thesis will concentrate on two localized areas: (1) Fort Ord Army Hospital (an MTF) in California, and (2) a localized area called catchment¹, in the vicinity of the military treatment facility. In order for the beneficiaries to use CHAMPUS, they must first obtain an NAS (non-availability statement) that the MTF cannot provide the required care.

The analysis and comparison of costs will be limited to a particular inpatient specialty or procedure, Obstetrics, which FT Ord can provide.

Within the financial records for the catchment area and Fort Ord Army Hospital, the procedure for analysis will focus on Obstetrics costs which were paid for by using CHAMPUS funds in 1990. This is the most recent year for which complete set and relevant data exists. Consequently, and for consistency, the costs to be used for the Ft Ord-MTF (Obstetrics) will be for 1990.

¹This catchment area include all beneficiaries residing near Fort Ord (within 40 mile radius) who use CHAMPUS as their primary insurer for inpatient care.

E. METHODOLOGY

Normally, participating health care providers bill CHAMPUS, and other government agencies according to a set of standards and codes for each procedure performed.

The research uses data on cost per admission from the CHAMPUS Inpatient Availability Statement (NAS) report. The analysis concentrates on the CHAMPUS cost for NAS (Obstetrics) cases because these cases are the best candidates for recapture. The Inpatient NAS report provides the combined cost of hospital and professional services for NAS cases in 27 hospital specialties.

The MTF cost per admission for obstetrics patients is developed using data from the Medical Expense and Performance - Reporting System (MEPRS). MEPRS tracks total costs (hospitalization and physician costs) and occupied bed days (OBDs) by functional work centers. MEPRS data on cost per OBD by work center can be used to calculate cost per admission given information on treatment protocols that identify the number of days the typical patient remains in each MEPRS work center. The cost of each protocol is calculated by summing the product of number of days spent in each work center and corresponding cost per OBD.

II. THE MILITARY HEALTH CARE

A. OVERVIEW

Both Chapters II and III will further explore the DoD and CHAMPUS programs. These chapters will also note some differences between the two.

B. THE MILITARY HEALTH CARE SYSTEM AND ITS PROBLEMS

For many years, military beneficiaries have enjoyed unlimited medical benefits. However, for the past decade these benefits have shrunk for many beneficiaries as the military struggles to bring health care costs under control. Economic and political realities are making it harder to fulfill promises of adequate benefits for service members, retirees, and their dependents [Ref. 4:p. 10]. In addition, deductibles have tripled for CHAMPUS beneficiaries, except for dependents of service members below grade E-5, and dental premiums have gone up as well.

These cutbacks come on top of longstanding complaints of dependents and retirees about military medicine: crowded emergency rooms, long waits for appointments and limited access to dental care. Furthermore, staff shortages have prevented some military facilities from using all their services; some operating suites and intensive care units have been closed. The war in the Persian Gulf exacerbated the

situation, adding reservists' (who were called for active duty) families to those seeking services, while pulling staff away from military hospitals.

The military medical system is confusing for most beneficiaries. Different categories of people, active duty, retirees, and the dependents of each, eligible for different benefits. What they are eligible for is not necessarily what is available at their local installation.

To cope with skyrocketing medical costs, the military is moving towards enrolling CHAMPUS-eligible beneficiaries in networks of doctors who agree to rates set by the government. The consequence is that patients would lose the freedom to choose their own health care provider but would pay less and find more medical staff accessible. [Ref. 5:pp. 12-13]

C. UNDERSTANDING MILITARY HEALTH CARE

To understand military medicine, it is important to note that active-duty individuals are treated first before others. Preservation of the fighting force is military medicine's fundamental mandate. Treatment of others comes only if medical staff and resources are available after caring for those in uniform.

Second on the list are dependents of active-duty members, including dependents of reservists on active duty. Retirees and their dependents comes last.

As with any hospital, however, the military's priority list is put aside during emergencies. No one in need of emergency medical care is turned away.

Members on active duty receive free medical care, including hospitalization, medicines, immunization shots, regular physical exams and routine dental care. Also, all military hospitals can treat any member of the seven uniformed services: the Army, Marine Corps, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, Public Health Service, and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. And active-duty members who cannot get to a military facility for emergency medical care may be treated at civilian hospitals; the government will pay the bill.

Access to the Department of Defense's medical resources is controlled by DEERS (Defense Eligibility and Enrollment Reporting System). This is the military's computerized roster of people eligible for military benefits; active-duty personnel are automatically listed and family members qualifying as dependents must also be enrolled.

D. ACTIVE DUTY DEPENDENTS

Dependents of active-duty members and activated reserves are eligible for treatment at military treatment facilities as long as they are enrolled in DEERS.

Those qualifying as dependents include:

- 1. The spouse and unmarried children (under 21 years of age) of active-duty members;
- 2. Unmarried children over 21 who receive more than 50 percent of their financial support from a military parent (limited to children with physical or mental handicap);
- 3. Unmarried children not yet 23 years old who are full time students at accredited colleges and who must depend on a military parent;
- 4. Parents or parents-in-law who live in a residence provided or maintained by their active-duty son or daughter (in-law) and who receive more than half their financial support from the service member; and
- 5. Unremarried widows and widowers of active duty members or retirees. [Ref. 1:p. 15-20]

Dependents can receive different kinds of medical services at military treatment facilities and this includes but is not
limited to: treatment of medical and surgical conditions,
physical examinations, prescriptions and non-prescription
drugs, maternity and infant care, diagnostic tests and
services, emergency dental care, and ambulance service when
medically necessary.

E. RETIREES' AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

As with active-duty dependents, retirees and their families do not face any charges for outpatient treatment at military treatment facilities.

Enlisted members are not charged for inpatient care while retired officers and warrant officers pay a nominal fee of

\$4.90 a day for meals (for 1991). Spouses and dependents of retirees' are billed \$8.55 a day (for 1991).

Retirees are also eligible for medical care from the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). Priority is determined as follows:

- 1. First priority (Category A) includes all veterans with service connected disabilities; veterans claiming exposure to Agent Orange while serving in Vietnam; and those veterans claiming exposure to ionizing radiation through occupation in Hiroshima or Nagasaki, Japan following detonation of the nuclear device or through testing of those or other such devices. Veterans such as former prisoners of war are automatically included in Category A. Also included are veterans with an annual income of \$17,240 or less if they have no dependents, or \$20,688 with one dependent, plus \$1,150 for each additional dependent. This group is considered mandatory; and
- 2. Discretionary care that is provided if space and resources are available, covers veterans with disabilities that are not service-connected and whose annual income is between \$17,241-\$22,986 if they have no dependents, or between \$20,689-\$\$28733 with one dependent, plus \$1,150 for each additional dependent. Veterans in this category must pay a deductible equal to what is paid under Medicare, \$628 in 1991. They are also charged \$10 a day for inpatient care, \$5 a day for nursing home care, and \$26 for each outpatient visit. [Ref. 6:pp. 17-18]

F. OTHER HEALTH CARE SERVICES

In an effort to reduce and alleviate overcrowding at military treatment facilities, the services have opened a number of medical clinics. These clinics are manned by civilian health care practitioners and under contract to provide primary care to both active-duty and retired military

members and their dependents. The Navy calls its clinics NavCare; the Army and Air Force call them PRIMUS. Eligible members and their dependents may avail themselves of any of these clinics, which offer services free of charge. Services available at these clinics includes treatment for minor illnesses, routine physical exams, diagnostic services, X-rays, prescriptions and laboratory work.

Members on active duty are also entitled to a complete dental care in military dental clinics. Active-duty dependents, including dependents of recalled reservists, retirees and their dependents, in that order of priority, may receive dental care at these facilities on a space-available basis. Such care is free, except that all dependents must pay for prosthetic devices. These charges reflect the cost of the materials and not the personnel costs.

The Department of Defense also offers active-duty dependents in the U.S. and its territories dental treatment by civilian dentists through an insurance plan. The plan provides diagnostic care, oral exams, and preventive care such as fluoride treatments, through participating dentists at no additional charge. The plan pays 80 percent of the other charges and the patient pays 20 percent. [Ref. 7:pp. 1-5]

III. THE CHAMPUS PROGRAM

A. BACKGROUND

Health care for military beneficiaries is provided through a dual system: The Navy, Air Force, and Army operate 137 hospitals and numerous clinics in the U.S. and overseas. When military treatment facilities cannot provide care for all eligible beneficiaries, their health care needs may be augmented by CHAMPUS, a health insurance plan that reimburses for health care services provided by civilian doctors to military dependents and beneficiaries below the age of 65.

[Ref. 9:p. 1]

CHAMPUS was created by Congress to supplement the military's hospitals and clinics and to provide health care to retirees and their dependents who live far away from a military treatment facility.

However, CHAMPUS does not cover all medical procedures.

Even in cases of treatments it does cover, CHAMPUS does not automatically reimburse patients for all costs.

B. THE CHAMPUS PROGRAM AND ITS PROBLEMS

CHAMPUS has not been without criticism. Complaints have surfaced regarding how much military families must pay and delays in reimbursement.

Increased usage, coupled with sharply rising medical costs, has led CHAMPUS running over budget in recent years. This problem is not unique to the CHAMPUS program and has been experienced by most health insurance programs covering payments to hospitals, doctors, and other health care providers. [Ref. 2:pp. I-8,9]

The CHAMPUS program was designed originally to augment the military hospitals. However, it has become more of an enhancement to the military health care system provided to service members and its eligible beneficiaries. This is evidenced by the increase in its budget and the number of claims filed. In 1989, its total DoD budget was \$2,742.1 million, up from \$2,506.3 million in 1988 [Ref. 2:p. III-3].

In 1989, the number of total claims was 11,657,348, up from 10,678,201 in 1988 [Ref. 2:p. VI-35].

C. HOW CHAMPUS PROGRAM WORKS

As with all health care programs, care is generally divided into outpatient and inpatient. Inpatient treatment occurs when an individual is admitted to a hospital with the reasonable expectation that such individual will stay at least 24 hours. Outpatient occurs in a physician's office or clinic, or during a house call.

With CHAMPUS, families are free to choose outpatient care from civilian providers with few restrictions. In the case of inpatient care, beneficiaries must have prior approval to use

a civilian hospital, or CHAMPUS will not cover the cost. However, under emergency condition this prior approval can be waived. Active-duty beneficiaries and retirees living within the catchment area of a military treatment facility must check there first to see if it can provide the treatment. Again, in emergencies, no one is turned away from a military hospital or clinic.

The catchment area was once the region within a 40-mile radius around a military treatment facility. These areas now are defined by ZIP codes. If the military hospital cannot provide inpatient care, patients may be referred to a civilian hospital. Patients are given written authorization to use civilian facility and the authorization is called a non-availability statement (DD Form 1251).

Basically, the following groups are eligible for CHAMPUS benefits: Dependents of active duty members; surviving spouses and unmarried children of service members who died while on active duty; spouses and unmarried children of reservists who are ordered to active duty for more than 30 days, and the survivors of reservists who died on active duty; member of the reserves between the ages of 60 and 65 who are qualified to receive retired pay; surviving spouses and children of deceased retirees (spouses who remarry are ineligible unless married to eligible member); and children of active-duty member or retiree up to age 21 if not married, and to 23 years old if not married and in school full time.

As a rule, CHAMPUS coverage automatically ends when a participant turns 65. Most military retirees and their dependents lose CHAMPUS eligibility when they become eligible for Social Security's Medicare program. However, retirees and their dependents keep their privilege for treatment in military hospitals.

D. THE CHAMPUS REFORM INITIATIVE

In February 1988, the DoD awarded a contract to Foundation Health Corporation (FHC) to implement the CHAMPUS Reform Initiative (CRI). Costs of running the military health care system in recent years have been escalating rapidly and exceeded \$2.7 billion in fiscal year 1989. To contain these costs and to respond to criticism regarding access to military health care, and improve coordination between military and civilian health care providers, the DoD has developed the CHAMPUS Reform Initiative.

Basically, the most important features of the CRI are the following:

- Selection of several contractors, each responsible for the financing and delivery of CHAMPUS services in an entire area;
- A price fixed prospectively for all covered services delivered to CHAMPUS beneficiaries in the area;
- 3. An alternative to current CHAMPUS, CHAMPUS Prime, that would offer improved coverage of primary care, reduced cost sharing, and simpler procedures to those

beneficiaries who enroll in the plan and use a panel of preferred civilian providers selected by the contractor;

- 4. A Health Care Finder to help beneficiaries obtain appointments in the military facilities, referrals to appropriate civilian providers, and medical record transfers; and
- 5. Resource sharing agreements between each civilian contractor and military hospital in his/her area in which the contractor agrees to provide manpower and other resources needed to increase capacity utilization within these hospitals. [Ref. 3:pp. 1-2]

The CRI is undergoing trials in two states, California and Hawaii. And if its successful, the system will be phased in to other regions of the country in the future.

IV. METHODOLOGY

A. SOURCES OF DATA

The data used for this research come from two sources.

The Fort Ord Army Hospital in Fort Ord, California furnished
the MEPRS cost and related data on Obstetrics care for the
fiscal year 1990.

The second source was through the Office of Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (OCHAMPUS) in Aurora, Colorado. OCHAMPUS provided the Health Care Summary Report and Inpatient NAS Reports. The Health Care Summary Report shows CHAMPUS utilization and cost data for the Fort Ord catchment area and the Inpatient NAS Report which was primarily used in this research shows the catchment area utilization and cost data by whether an NAS was required with the 27 hospital specialties.

B. OVERVIEW OF MEPRS

The Medical Expense and Performance Reporting System (MEPRS) contains cost and workload performance information for military treatment facilities.

The MEPRS recognizes six general functional areas within an MTF: inpatient, outpatient, dental, ancillary services, support services, and special programs. Support services are laundry service, food service, housekeeping, and other non

medical functions. Ancillary services include clinical laboratory, pathology, radiology, pharmacy, and other related activities that contribute in the proper diagnosis and treatment of admitted patients. Special programs consist of graduate medical education, public health services, and decedent affairs. Within the general functional areas, MEPRS further identifies separate work centers of the MTF in which different services are performed. Therefore, it tracks workload and expenses by these work centers.

Expenses from ancillary and support work centers are reallocated or reassigned to inpatient and other work centers and other final operating accounts. This allocation is the percentage of the ancillary and support workload performed for the work centers. For example, the performance factor for Blood Bank is weighted procedure (see Appendix A for sample of performance factors). If 20% are served for Obstetrics, then 20% of the cost of operating the Blood Bank are allocated to Obstetrics care (work center).

Expense information are entered in the MEPRS in the form of Direct Expense Schedule (DES) and it identifies all expenses directly associated with a given work center.

Workload statistics are recorded into MEPRS in the form of stepdown assignment statistics (SAS) data sets. Each SAS data set is composed of a numerical identifier that is related with a specific workload measure and a list of MEPRS work center and corresponding workload for that work center. Also, other

workload information are gathered from numerous sources, including the Automated Quality of Care Evaluation Support System (AQCESS), which provides reports on OBD's by work center; Tri-service Medical Information System (TRIMIS), which provides reports on ancillary workload.

The EAS is the automated system that processes the actual cost allocations from intermediate operating accounts to final accounts. The beginning of the process is the DES that identifies the direct expense of each work center, including ancillary and support work centers. During the stepdown process, the direct expenses of ancillary and support work centers are charged to the inpatient, outpatient, dental, or special programs work centers benefiting from the expenses.

During the final or post-stepdown, expenses from cost pools are allocated to final operating accounts. Cost pools are established when costs are shared by two or more by final operating accounts.

The Final Purification Report identifies the expense distribution from cost pools to final accounts. This report shows the dollar amounts calculated and allocated during purification.

The Computation Summary reveals the breakdown of total work centers expense by direct expense, support costs, ancillary costs, expense from cost pools, and a final purified amount.

C. CALCULATING COSTS USING PATIENT TREATMENT PROTOCOLS

To estimate MTF cost per patient admission, MTF physicians must identify major types of hospital admission and develop patient treatment protocol² for each.

May [Ref 8] developed a method to estimate the costs. The cost of treating each patient admitted can be determined from the treatment protocols and the cost per OBD for each work center. The cost is estimated as weighted sum of the cost per OBD in each work center where the weights equal the number of days spent in each work center:

Cost per admission = wi*Ci+...wn*Cn i=1 to n, where

wi = number of OBD spent in work center i

Ci = cost per OBD in work center i

n = number of work centers.

D. MEPRS DATA

Data provided by Fort Ord Army Hospital covered only the inpatient services³ and work centers that affected the computation of Obstetrics cost. Of the data provided, five reports were used for analysis that are directly related to

²For this research, a treatment protocol is defined as the number of days the typical patient with a certain diagnosis remains in each MEPRS work center.

³To date, there are 18 identified inpatient specialties within the Fort Ord Army Hospital (see Appendix J-Inpatient Specialties).

the Obstetrics cases. Referring to Appendix B (Occupied Bed Day Data), this report accounts all the occupied bed days for the inpatient work centers. Appendix C (Direct Expense Report), this report shows the total salary of clinicians working in those particular work centers. Appendix D (Stepdown Schedule) enumerates all the ancillary and support costs allocated to the affected work centers. Appendix E (Final Purification Report) shows the allocated costs to different work centers from the ward cost pools. Appendix F (Computation Summary Report) integrates all the different costs allocated to the work centers.

The MEPRS data provided by Fort Ord Army Hospital are up to September 30, 1990 and considered complete. However, the data provided need to be analyzed carefully because of the system's (MEPRS) inherent limitations. For example, data are collected by functional work center instead of by individual patient. When admitted patients in a given specialty are treated in two or more work centers, cost per admission must be calculated from data on cost per OBD by work center and treatment protocol developed for the specialty. Second, since MEPRS is an allocative system, a work center's share of support and ancillary costs is determined from its relative share of weighted workload. If weights do not capture all differences in resource consumption for ancillary and support costs, then the allocated cost could be different from the

true cost. As a result of these limitations, the cost per admission in a given specialty using patient treatment protocols cannot be truly estimated from the true cost.

E. CHAMPUS COST DATA

The data provided by OCHAMPUS particularly the Inpatient Non Availability Statement report is considered complete for the fiscal year 1991. This report provides costs and utilization data for twenty-seven medical specialties. The report comprises the following types of admissions: emergency (no NAS required); and non-emergency (NAS required or not required). This feature is very important because in NAS cases, CHAMPUS is the primary insurer and a given MTF generally absorbs all the costs of the admission. Thus, NAS cases are the best candidates for recapture. Furthermore, this report excludes the following types of data: CHAMPVA; contractor-denied claims; claims with zero government cost; hospital outpatient care; ambulatory surgery for active duty dependents; and all foreign country data (except Mexico and Canada).

F. METHODOLOGY APPLICATION

Applying May's [Ref. 8] methodology on the MEPRS data, we can have a <u>best estimate</u> of the admission cost on different inpatient specialty or services (see Footnote 3) for the Fort Ord Army Hospital. For Obstetrics cases, the total expenses

in fiscal year 1990 is \$2,449,541.00 which include the clinician salaries. The occupied bed days (OBD's) totaled to 4,844 for 1,628 patients admitted (this data was derived from SAS Admissions Report). Dividing 4,844 OBD's by 1,628 patients will result to average length of stay (ALOS) or occupied bed days of about three days (the exact number is 2.975 days). Furthermore, dividing the total expenses of \$2,449,541.00 by the occupied bed days of 4,844 will yield a dollar amount of \$505.69. This is the average cost per OBD in Obstetrics work center. To determine the total cost per admission for Obstetrics using the methodology:

Cost for each admission = wi*Ci+...wn*Cn i=1 to n, $wi= 3^4$ Ci= \$505.69 n= 1 (see Footnotes 2 and 4).

Therefore, the computed cost for each admission for Obstetrics at Fort Ord Army Hospital when using patient treatment protocol is \$1,504.63. This is the amount used for comparing the cost between MEPRS and CHAMPUS.

For CHAMPUS Obstetrics cases⁵ for the year 1990 (see Appendix G, Total All Categories of Beneficiaries section, NAS

⁴For the fiscal year 1990, 99.50% of patients admitted at Fort Ord Army Hospital for Obstetrics care were seen and treated at that work center. The remaining .50%, who were treated by two or more work center, were not included in the analysis because the effect is considered negligible in the final cost per admission.

⁵Obstetrics costs used in the computation are costs pertaining to mothers care only. Costs incurred for routine care for newborns are excluded. Similarly, Obstetrics costs incurred by the Fort Ord Army Hospital and used in the computation excludes newborn costs.

required), the total government cost is \$314,365 for a total of 98 inpatient admissions. Dividing the total government costs by 98 total admissions will yield \$3,207.80 average government cost per admission. The total hospital days or total occupied bed days is 272, divide this by total admissions will yield an average length of stay or average OBD of 2.77. Furthermore, dividing \$3,207.80 by the average OBD or length of stay will yield \$1,155.75 average government cost per occupied bed day.

V. DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

A. CHAPTER OVERVIEW

When to recapture? In order to answer this very important question when considering shifting (recapturing) CHAMPUS workload to a particular treatment facility, one has to explore the following issues that may affect the overall results of patients recapture. The primary goal of comparing CHAMPUS and MTF costs is to ascertain whether a given MTF can provide inpatient care at a lower cost than through CHAMPUS. However, the potential savings related to recapturing CHAMPUS workload vary significantly between patient to patient.

First, the potential savings that could be derived from shifting CHAMPUS workload is dependent upon recaptured admissions because CHAMPUS coverage varies by status of patients and private insurance coverage. For eligible dependents who have private insurance, CHAMPUS is considered a secondary insurer. Therefore, it only pays charges not covered by the dependent's insurance. [Ref. 9:pp. 4-8]

Second, many eligible dependents are considered transparent to the military health care system due to their infrequent use or non-use of military facilities or CHAMPUS for some or most of their health care needs. Therefore, drawing this population will increase the workload of the

wilitary treatment facilities. And, since this population are viewed as ghosts by the military system, the potential gain in number may not reduce the CHAMPUS workload in equal number. In other words, cost advantage in favor of the MTF that exists per admission would be eventually offset by disproportionate increases in MTF workload. [Ref. 10:p. 1]

Another issue to consider when recapturing is the potential effect on some aspects of medical care, as well as the overall satisfaction on the part of the recaptured population. By increasing the number of patients seen within a particular specialty, the access to that health care service would probably be affected not only in terms of longer lines (waiting to make an appointment or follow-up) but also the quality of time spent by the physician with his or her patient. Also, when recaptured, patients who are used to shopping for health services outside the MTF may no longer have any option available to them to see a particular specialist or doctor they prefer (exceptions are emergency conditions) and in some cases this will cause patient dissatisfaction.

B. ANALYSIS

Based on the data derived from MEPRS and OCHAMPUS, a summary of the computation is created to show the final costs and workload for the Obstetrics care incurred by the Fort Ord Army Hospital and CHAMPUS for FY 1990.

Referring to Appendix I, the average cost per admission at the MTF level is about \$1,504.00. This number represents the average cost for inpatient care provided for one Obstetrics specialty patient. Again, this sum was derived by multiplying the average cost per occupied bed day, \$505.69, by the average length of stay, which is 2.975 days.

The CHAMPUS cost on Obstetrics care per admission within the Fort Ord catchment area is about \$3,207.00 and this number is derived from the CHAMPUS NAS Inpatient Report.

Based on the above there is a significant cost difference between the two programs. The net difference of \$1,703 for each patient admission could represent a substantial savings if these Obstetrics patients (NAS required) were recaptured and treated within the military treatment facility.

It should be noted, however, that the remaining 17 medical specialties within the Fort Ord Hospital were not compared and analyzed. Thus, the potential savings from these specialties and what their impact could be on the overall CHAMPUS for the catchment area cannot be truly ascertained. Despite this, it is widely accepted that military treatment facilities of any size can deliver health care service at lower cost. If this is so, the potential savings in recapturing patients under different types of medical specialties can be substantial not only to the overall CHAMPUS budget for the Fort Ord catchment area but also to the rest of catchment areas within the CHAMPUS program.

Based on the data analyzed in this research, shifting CHAMPUS Obstetrics (NAS required) cases back to the Fort Ord Army Hospital could have significantly reduced the overall CHAMPUS cost for the Fort Ord catchment for FY 1990. This potential savings represents a reduction in expenditures of almost 76 percent of the grand total of CHAMPUS and patients costs in all Obstetrics categories in the Fort Ord area. These categories are emergency medical treatment (no NAS required), inpatient care where no NAS is required, and inpatient care where NAS is required. Similarly, when the OBD cost on Obstetrics was compared to the CHAMPUS cost for FY 1990, the difference was almost a 50% in favor of MTF.

It should be noted, however, that there are extra costs associated with any form of medical specialty recapture. And these costs are considered significant. Example of these costs are salaries of new doctors, additional ancillary costs, and other support costs. In the case of Fort Ord Army Hospital, a practical way to measure and to forecast future costs when recapturing Obstetrics patients are the use of established cost per occupied bed days. These costs are considered a good measure when comparing future costs since the OBD cost is composed of average cost incurred by the military hospital for doctors salaries, ancillary services, and other support costs for that work center.

Furthermore, in analyzing the results of the data contained in this research, there are various reasons for

increases in number of CHAMPUS Obstetrics patients being referred to the civilian facilities, as well as increases in costs both for the CHAMPUS and patients within the Fort Ord catchment area.

Currently, there are constraints in the supply of military physicians within Fort Ord Army Hospital not only Obstetrics specialty but also in most clinical areas of the hospital. This situation is not unique to Fort Ord and is being experienced by other military treatment facilities as well. Since this is not unique to Fort Ord it is expected that some services have to be cut back and some have to be closed due to lack of necessary resources. Also, in addition its requirement to provide health care to eligible beneficiaries, the military hospital is also mandated by higher authorities to support any national contingencies. For example, during the Persian Gulf crisis, a large number of medical personnel stationed at the hospital were sent to the area to support deployed personnel. And in anticipation of future casualties the hospital reduced and/or cut back some of its services available to eligible beneficiaries in the catchment area. This action by the hospital, preserving and conserving, some of its resources for contingencies, have resorted to more outside referrals of patients not only Obstetrics care but of other specialties as well. In FY 1990, the majority of patients (Obstetrics with NAS authorization)

who were referred to outside providers were dependents of active duty personnel. Therefore, the bulk of the total cost was absorbed by the government.

It should be noted that in cases where a patient is seen by a nonparticipating provider, the cost in excess of allowed CHAMPUS amount must be paid by the patient. This plus the cost associated with yearly deductible payments will tend to increase the overall cost paid by the patient. So in reality, CHAMPUS covers less than 100 percent of the reported costs for active-duty dependents and covers less than 75 percent of the costs for retiree families. But since most of the civilian providers participate in CHAMPUS, thus agreeing to absorb costs in excess of the allowed CHAMPUS charges, the total costs reported and analyzed in this research approximates the allowable charges.

Another reason in increased cost is the medical status of the patient itself. Patients are automatically referred to civilian providers when specialized care is needed because of some complications in their pregnancy and Fort Ord Army Hospital cannot provide the appropriate care. However, the correct number of these patients (with complications) cannot be obtain since their inpatient records were not screened for this purpose. At any rate, any kind of specialized care, if it were needed and obtained, will undoubtedly increase the cost of Obstetrics care. Thus, the potential savings calculated maybe overstated.

There is also the question of patient's proximity to the Fort Ord Army Hospital. There are cases where beneficiaries live in the outermost perimeter of the catchment area thereby access to the care needed is prohibitive. In these cases where geographic considerations have to be considered, the prudent choice by the military hospital is to refer them to the nearest civilian provider.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. CONCLUSIONS

Estimate in comparing Obstetrics costs between a military treatment facility and CHAMPUS. The CHAMPUS cost per patient admission can be derived from the CHAMPUS Inpatient NAS Report. The military treatment facility's cost can be constructed using patient treatment protocols, which describe the hospital stay by work center for different categories of patients, and cost per occupied bed day estimates from MEPRS.

An important requirement when using this methodology, however, is the determination of relevant clinical specialties and the proper use of treatment protocols. Another requirement is the accuracy of workload data and costs data used in MEPRS.

By comparing MTF and CHAMPUS costs, a given military treatment facility can identify those specialty areas in which to reduce costs either by increasing the MTF's workload (use of recapture and/or normal increase of appointments) or increasing referrals to outside providers. Similarly, additional recapture of different types of medical specialties must also be based on the requirements of the MTF,

availability of resources and consideration on the needs of a given specialty population.

Based on the computations performed in Chapter IV and the analysis conducted in Chapter V, it can be concluded that recapturing and treating eligible beneficiaries at Fort Ord Army Hospital has a cost saving potential. In FY 1990, in the case of Obstetrics specialty, the MTF could have saved approximately \$1,703.00 per admission if these patients were recaptured.

However, when considering recapture, the overall mission capability of a given MTF must be seriously taken in to account. For example in FY 1990, in the case of the Fort Ord Army Hospital, the hospital has experienced shortages in military doctors especially in the Obstetrics and Gynecology specialty. This situation can be attributed to the longstanding manning constraint within the DoD health care system and which to some extent exacerbated by the war in the Persian Gulf when large number of the hospital's medical personnel have to leave to support deployed military personnel. Consequently, for that year, the military hospital resorted to more referrals of Obstetrics patients to outside health care providers.

Another aspect in a recapture that is very important are the high costs related to any patients needing specialized health care. If the additional costs to be incurred in

specialized services are more than the savings to be realized, then it would probably be cost-effective to leave these patients unrecaptured.

Also, use of OBD's as a gauge on forecasting savings in costs must be done with caution since derivation of historical costs may not truly reflect the future costs.

Finally, in light of the constraints placed on Fort Ord Army Hospital, as well as to other military treatment facilities within DoD, it would be prudent now to address any aspects of cost containment since the overall cost of providing military health care is rapidly escalating.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS

This research has analyzed and compared the costs of one medical specialty, Obstetrics, between a military treatment facility and its catchment area. Based on the data analyzed, it is evident that a significant savings could be realized when patients are recaptured back to the MTF. However, before attempting to shift major CHAMPUS workloads, by recapturing other specialties, a further study should be conducted in order to ascertain the full impact of the possible change, and to make sure that these changes are warranted. It should be noted that potential savings related with shifting CHAMPUS workload back to the MTF can vary because of dependents' status, private insurance coverage, and other costs associated

with any recapture (i.e., additional salaries for new doctors, expected increase in ancillary and support costs, etc.).

Therefore, it is recommended that:

- 1. Cost analysis of the remaining 17 medical specialties, in the case of Fort Ord Army Hospital, be conducted and compared to the other CHAMPUS specialties within the Fort Ord catchment area. Such a study should cover a four to five year span in order to determine if there is a growing trend.
- 2. A study should also be conducted, in conjunction with the above recommendation, on number and status of beneficiaries carrying any private insurance within the catchment area. If there is a significant number of beneficiaries having private insurance coverage, then it would probably be cost-effective to leave this population unrecaptured.

APPENDIX A

EXAMPLE OF PERFORMANCE DESCRIPTIONS

FORT ORD ARMY HOSPITAL, FY 1990

ACCT	DESCRIPTIONS PE	RFORMANCE DESCRIPTION
DAA	PHARMACY	WEIGHTED PROCEDURE
DBA	CLINICAL PATHOLOGY	WEIGTED PROCEDURE
DBC	BLOOD BANK	WEIGHTED PROCEDURE
DCA	RADIOLOGY	WEIGHTED PROCEDURE
DDA	ELECTROCARDIOGRAPHY	PROCEDURE
DDD	PULMONARY FUNCTION	WEIGHTED PROCEDURE
DEA	CENTRAL STERILE	HOURS OF SERVICE
	SUPPLY	
DFA	ANESTHESIOLOGY	MINUTES OF SERVICE
DFB	SURGICAL SUITE	MINUTES OF SERVICE
DHD	PHYSICAL THERAPY	VISIT
DGA	SAME DAY SURGERY	MINUTES OF SERVICE

STATISTICAL DATA SET (OCCUPIED BED DAY DATA)
FORT ORD ARMY HOSPITAL, FY 1990

APPENDIX B

UCA CODE	QTR 1	QTR 2	QTR 3	QTR 4

AAAA	1452	1203	1170	1332
AAFA	0	4	8	4
AAHA	210	253	220	245
AAJA	6	13	7	39
ABAA	805	868	1022	920
ABCA	46	59	42	21
ABEA	46	41	46	0
ABFA	130	191	160	142
ABGA	160	147	201	151
ABKA	227	301	156	4
ACAA	245	356	355	315
ACBA	1306	1011	1168	1359
ADAA	490	429	404	422
ADBA	893	782	866	839
AEAA	604	871	1008	934
AEBA	79	132	109	152
AFAA	921	1047	863	888
AGAA	243	309	329	302
AGBA	3	10	1	1
AGCA	585	732	821	683
AGDA	152	79	82	78
AGEA	20	49	61	16
AGFA	0	0	0	26
AGGA	3	4	0	23
AGHA	231	196	280	291

APPENDIX C (DIRECT EXPENSE REPORT) .

PREPARED: 90 NDV 27 1041 HRS FAGE DISPLAY
FACILITY NAME: MECDAC FI DRD
FACILITY CODE: M2C4AA DOD REGIUN: U6

PEN HAA-QUE

QUARTER 4 : OI JUL - 30 SEP FY 90 PAGE 30 DES DATA SET

FAC IL	LINE TETAL		### Av. 1	UCA	UCA	LLA
LNO CODE	EXPENSE	SAS	SUB AHI	SAS SUB AHT	SAS SUB AMI	2 IMA BUZ ZAZ
01 DES 30	4 N					
2	70648	AAAA	O	0	C	0
3	5022		0	0	6	0
4	6004		0	0	i	0
5	29233	AAHA	O	0	Ü	0
6	825522	AAXA	O	0	L	0
7	575345	HXAA	0	0	O	0
8	159543	ABAA	O	0	0	0
9	12843	ABCA	0	0	0	0
10	18629	ABEA	0	0	U	0
11	61437	ABFA	0	0	C	0
12	34999	AbGA	0	0	0	0
13	68883	AEKA	0	0	0	0
14	90288		0	0	L	0
15	17608		0	0	0	0
16	132982		0	C	(,	0
17	1136666		0	0	Ü	0
18	111261		0	C	Ü	0
19	36145		0	0	U	0
20	525123		0	0	U	0
21	515592		0	0	C	0
22	178637		0	C	Ü	0
23	24208		0	0	0	0
24	713469		0	0	U	0
25	69689		0	C	U	0
26	505763		0	C	0	0
21		AFXB	0	0	(0
28	-	AFXC	0	C	0	0
29	75553		0	0	· ·	0
30	144918		0	0	·	0
31	30424		0	. 0	0	0
32 33	13793		0	. 0	Ü	0
	343189		0	0	(0
34 35	161564 67309		0	C	· ·	0
TOTAL	6884488	DACA	U	C	C	O

APPENDIX D	(STEPDOWN SCHEDULE)	
1 0000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	00000000

PREPARED: 90 NO FACILITY NAME: FACILITY CODE: DUD REGION: 06	90 NOV 27 1 AME: MECDAC F ODE: WZGAAA	1059 HRS F1 ORD	STEPOL	ICHN SCHEDULE	ш			PCN NAA-6	-010		
QUARTER 4 : PAGE 8-4	: 01 JEL -	30 SEP FY 90	YEAR 10	DATE							
	EJAA	EKAA		EKAE	EKAG	EX	<	OAAE		DBXA	086
ABEA		0	0	8 1 1 1 1)		3018			0)))
ABFA	19273	0	0	9	၁	•	26334	0	0	0	
ABGA	20387	0	0	0	0	0	25414			0 0	
ABKA	21264	9 5	o c	0 0	ب ب	၁	48276	77	• 0	0	
ABAN	02.696) 3	•)	9	110026	515	29	00	
CBA	349856	. 0))	0		9	5	126	7.1	0	
ACXA		0	0	0	9	0	rı.	0		0	
ADAA	S	0	0	0	3	•	226085	.	57	၁ (
A DBA	104565	0	3 0	0	9 6	9	119523	91	9	ی د	
ADXA	9 6	• •	9 0	9 0			12109	0)	0	
AEAA	105109	0	, 0	0	0	9	161411	16	6.	0	
AEBA		0	3	0	0	3	20636	0	9	3	
AEXA		0	9	0	0	•	2 9519		0	ပ (
AFAA	115052	0	0	0 (0 (9 6	23802	195	-	ی د	
AFBA	9 6	0 0	9 Ç	9 6	9 6	9 9	4452	• 0	0) o	
AFXB		• •) ວ	0	.	0		0	0	၁	
AFXC	0	0	0	9	ပ	0		0	0	0	
A GAA	36558	0	9	0	٠	0	9	123	609	0 0	
AGBA	464	9 0	0	0	9	9 3	12584	• «	0 0) (
ACOA	12066	9 0	o C	9 6		9 6	4 6	762	527	9	
AGEA	4517	0))	0	ن ر	· ၁	_	128	783	O	
AGFA	804	0	0	0	•	•	0	0	0	၁	
A GCA	9	0	0	9	0	.	0	0	9 6)	
AGHA	30875	0	3 (9 0	3 (0 0	5353		261)	
DARA	3 6	23567) 3)	۽ ر	> C	4 4	r ~	0 4 4))	
B A C A	9 6	11981	> c	9 0	ي ر		17649	-	35	د ،	
BACE	0	330	•	• •	د د	0	•	0	0	C	
BAGA	0	443	0	0	•	•	-	0	0	0	
BAKA	0	0908	0	0	•	0	9636	0	25	0	
BAKE	0	2198	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	.	
BALA	0	0959)	9 (، د	0 (1286	0 0	9 9	ב כ	
BAPA	00	32301	3	0	5 د	-	9796	5	20	9 3	
2 4 4 6	> C	6771	2 3) <	ت د		79) 0	21	· つ	
ဆ		16162) 0	0	, ,	0	44269	9	9	ر	

PREPARED: 90 NOV 27 1059 HRS FACILITY NAME: MECDAC FI URD FACILITY CODE: W2C4AA 000 REGION: 06

QUARTER 4: 01 JUL - 30 SEP FY 90 YEAR TO DATE PAGE 9-4

BEA 5	C8 5	0	0	1336	0	0	0	213	0	
14	C1 1	0	0	5910	3244	0	0	35	0	23
24	50 0	0	0	4087	0	0	0	35	J	_
82	54	0	0	6609	0	0	0	1682	J	•
		0	0	၁	0	0	0	0	0	_
269	98 5	0	0	10994	0	0	0	0	0	0
1314	23	0	0	1302	13515	0	0	18	၁	0
:	0	0	0	ى	0	0	0	0	ون	0
87	1	0	0	405	19292	0	0	961	1335	1683
72612		0	0	0	10964	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	ر	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	ပ	0	0	0	0	C	0
•	71 40	0	0	3929	39913	0	0	106	171	23
34	64 11	0	0	4351	19	0	0	68	9	0
	0	0	0	9	8442	0	0	0	၁	0
161	62 42	0	0	27	2581	0	0	88	131	•
		0	0	J	0	0	0	0	၁	
		9	0	Ç	ગ	0	0	0	و	_
	0	0	0	J	0	0	0	0	၁	_
	0	0	0	9	J	0	0	0	7	
28158	58 104	0	0	225	64	0	0	0	9	1033
19		0	0	116	0	0	0	0	و	
		0	0	5386	0	0	0	18	0	920
		0	0	၁	0	0	0	0	9	398
		0	0	1451	0	0	0	0	0	
		0	0	•	0	0	9	0	ɔ :	
66A		0	0	163	0	0	0	18	ɔ :	O (
		0	0	9	0		0	0	_	- 4
119368		9	0	96	121281	112	0	6513	730	4566
	[7]	9	0	۰	9 10 1	0	0	68	ပ	0110
		0	0	0	3165	0	0	1516	0	07
		0	0	0	0	0	0		၁	0
•	29	0	0	0	120	0	0	106		
AKA 25	15	•	0	0	62804	149	0	11	11159	206
		0	0	ن	၁	0	0	0	16307	0
ALA		0	0		0	0	0	0	2	0
APA 166	1.4	0	0	21337	139	0	0	0	၁	0
	0 0	0	0	د	0	0	0	0	0	0
308	46	0	0	1964	88252	0	0	638	121	0527

1299

1873

118929

587

2081

LHUA

OHBA

0000000000000 6117 8 APZ 8 BAA 8 B B D A BAKA BALABAAPA BAKE

PEN MAA-012

PREPARED: 90 NOV 27 1059 HRS FACILITY NAME: MECDAC F1 URD FACILITY CODE: W2C4AA OOD REGION: 06

FINAL PURIFICATION

QUARTER 4: 01 JUL - 30 SEP FY 90 YEAR TO DATE PAGE 1-1

ACCT DESCRIPTION	EXP. AFT. STEPCOMN	ААХА	ААХН	ABXF	ACXA	ADXA	ACXB	AEXA
AAAA INTERNAL MEDICINE	1564251	925214	0	6301	0	0	99	151
	0	، د	0	0	0	0	Э :	0 (
	712	; ر	3	3 0	> 6	0 0	D 4	> C
AAAD AIDS	9 0	9 .	ə c	9 0	0 0	> c	> 0	0 0
A A DA DE DIA TOLOGO	9 6	, ,	9 3	0	0	0	9	0
	12063	1143		1312	0	0	0	309
	417065	4003	511638		0	0	2	309
	18627	12199	0	0	0	0	ر	155
	1302230	1302238-	0	0	0	0	ر	0
AAXH COMBINED CCU WARD 65	1085901	ر	1085907-	0	0		ر	0
ABAA GENERAL SURGERY	1666863	43459	1001	82967	0	54289	7	136313
	52408	15630	110807	•	2189	0	0	309
ABEA OPHTHALMOLEGY	8 28 22	512	0	13259	0	4586	2	2163
ABFA URAL SURGERY	419322	4193	0	46209	0	16287	၁	72666
	396697	12008	0	4332	0	80005	0	17 .
URBLOGY	390324	11818	3	19560	0	18777	ο,	01048
ABXM MINIMAL CARE NO 4S COST POOL	26 3864	٠	0	386	9	0	د	0
	286491	21920	0		10124	0	3	144 002
	1136120	162	2014	132	1306625	0	0	9888
ACXA WARD 5 E UB	2086769		0	0	2086769-	0	3	0
	585546	953	5037	0	0	494033	1627	0
MURSERY	420561	ပ	0	0	0		105634	0
MARO 6 S	826341	ပ	0	0	0	826341-	: د :	0
ADXB WARD 5 S NURSERY	916602	0	0	0	0	0	-209915	
AEAA ORTHOPEDICS		31451	0	56054	0	31145	ر	415645
AEBA PODIATRY	24 1149	3621	3	6827	0	11 715	0	~
AEXA HARD 4 M COMBINED SURGERY	1230812	ر	0	0	0	0	0	1230812-
	508513	J	0	0	0	0	ပ	0
	0	၁	0	0	0	0	0	0
AFXA HARO 7W PSYCFIATRY	49360	ر	0	0	0	0	၁	0
AFXB PSY RESOURCE SHARING 7M (PSY 1ECH)	1011	ر	0	0	0	0	၁	0
AFXC PSY RESOURCE SHARING 7M (RN)	820	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
	350110	207573	53389	131	0		7	3090
	26930	161	1001	394	~	571	0	1081
	684122	162	0	131	767283		0	1854
AGDA FAM PRAC PEGIAIRICS	123497	191	1008	0	0	111437	0	0
	19096	3621	0	1181	274	0	၁	18078
FAH PRAC	2233		0	0	0	0	0	-
AGGA FAM PRAC ORTHOPEDICS	2275	956		526	0	0	၁	3545

APPENDIX F (COMPUTATION SUMMARY)

PREPARED: 90 NOV 27 1059 HRS COMPUTATION SUMMARY FACILITY NAME: MECDAC FT DRD FACILITY CODE: N264AA DUD REGIUM: 06 PCN NAA-41

QUARTER 4: 01 JUL - 30 SEP FY 90 YEAR TO DATE PAGE 01

ACCI	DIRECT	SUPPURT	ANCIL	AFTER	NE I	PURIFIED
CODE	EXPENSE	CO31\$	COS15	STPDA	PURIF	EXPENSE
	2330014		3553003	1000127		10001734
A	7338024	5011125	7552087	19901236	0	19901236
AA	1820449	1073164	1507250	4400863	485854-	3915009
AAA	70648	3 / 8 9 2 9	1115386	1564963	9/1223	2536186
• * * *	76648	378929	1114674	1564251	971223	2535474
+ AAA B	0	Ü	0		0	0
+ AAA C	0	0	712	712	0	712
• AAA D	0	0	Ĺ	· ·	0	0
AAB	0	0	(Ĺ	0	0
+ AAB A	0	0	0	Ĺ	0	0
DAAD	0	0	C	(0	0
+ AAD A	0	0			0	0
AAF	6004	1756	4303	12063	2764	14827
+ AAF A	6004	1756	4303	12063	2764	14827
AAH	29233	68788	319044	417065	915950	1333015
+ AAH A	25233	68788	319044	417065	915950	1333015
LAA	5022	4917	8688	18627	12354	30981
ALAA+	5022	4917	8688	18621	12354	30981
AAX	1709542	618774	59829	2388145	4386145-	0
* A A X A	894284	373059	34895	13022 18	1102238-	0
* AAX H	815258	245715	24934	1085907	1085907-	0
AB	582387	481845	2208068	3272300	815125	4087425
ABA	159543	270015	1237305	1666863	5 180 35	2244898
+ ABA A	159543	2/0015	1237305	1066863	516035	2244898
ABC	13843	11540	21025	52408	128935	181343
+ A8C A	13843	11540	21025	52408	128935	181343
ABE	18629	10569	53624	82824	20280	103102
ABE A	18629	10569	53624	82822	2U 280	103102
ABF	6 14 3 7	48808	309077	419322	96355	515677
*ABFA	61437	48808	309077	419322	96355	515677
A8G	34999	49418	312280	396697	140071	536768
* A 8 G A	34999	49418	312286	196697	140071	536768
ABK	68882	53817	267625	390324	115313	505637
+ ABK A	68882	53817	267625	390324	115313	505637
ABX	225054	37678	1132	263864	263869-	0
* ABX M	225054	37678	1132	263864	263864-	0
AC	1653805	989844	1163737	3807386	566754-	3240632
ACA	77608	95686	417203	590497	200594	791091
* ACA A	77608	95686	417203	590491	200594	791091
ACB	132982	357937	639201	1130120	1319421	2449541
• ACB A	132982	35 1931	639201	1130120	13194 21	2449541
ACX	1443215	536221	107333	2086169	2086769-	0
+ ACX A	1443215	536221	107333	2086769	2086769-	U
AD	1394939	767049	587062	2 /49050	534563-	2214547
A DA	111261	139083	335202	585546	502320	1087866
+ ADA A	111261	139083	335202	5855 46	502320	1087866

	REPORT NO: FS130-001 DATE: 01 MAR 91 TIME: 07:20:25	D23 - H IMPATIENT RE FOR CARE	PORT (BASED ON RECEIVED FROM DEPENDENTS	ENEFICIARY CT, 1989 F ACTIVE D	MDUPLICATED) RESIDENCE ZIPC HRU SEP, 1990	00 €)	Corre	PAGE CTION PERIOD S ROBTES
	OTAL IMPATIENT CARE HOSPITAL AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES IMPATIENT)	ADVE I	LLERGY	CATEGORY ANDIOLOGY INEANE	CARE-INTERNA DERNATOLOGY E	NDOCRINOLOG	6 A S T R O	E H A T O
AVERAGE LEAST A STATE OF THE PART OF THE P	MERGEMCY MEDICAL TREATHENT ON MAS REQUIRED) USER BENEFICIARIES ADMISSIONS ANDRISSIONS AVERAGE ENGIN OF STAY AVERAGE DAILY PATIENT COAD TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/ADMISSIO	8 % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	7 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	00 001	-0000 %300	2.6 11,22 11,22 11,22 11,22 11,22	n 4mm1
### PROTIENT CARE *** ### REQUIRED #	MPATIENT CARE DONO NAS REQUIRED OUSER BENEFICIARIES APPRISTANCE FOR STAYENGE ENGINE OF STAYENGE ENGINE OF STAYENGE COVERNIENT COST OF STAYENGE CONTRACT COST OF STAYENGE CONTRACT COST OF STAYENGE CONTRACT COST OF STAYENGE COST OF	004-4001	00 001	26.02 96.64 97.80 85.647.10	00 001	00 001	00000001	M 0 0 0 4 1
USER BENEFILIARIES USER BENEFILIARIES ADMISSIONS AUSER BENEFILIARIES	MAS REQUIRED) USER BENEFICIARIES USER BENEFICIARIES APRISIONS HOSPITAL DAYS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAT TOTAL FOTIENT COST TOTAL FOTIENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/ADMISSIO	00 001	6 4 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	26.2.0 1.1.0.2.0 1.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0	00 001	2	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9
VEXAGE GOVERNMENT COSTON	USER BENEFILIARIES USER BENEFILIARIES ADMISSIONS HOSPITAL DAYS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY AVERAGE DAILY PATIENT LOAD TOTAL PATIENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST/ADMISSIO AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/ADMISSIO AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/ADMISSIO	- orven	4 4M4	co ≥ 1		2		0 L 0 N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N

REPORT NO: Fs: J-JO1 JATE: 01 WAR 91 [IME: G7:20:20	OSS - INPATIENT REPORTED	HAYS AH FT ORD. FPORT (BASED OM E RECEIVED FROM	CA BENEFICIARY OCT 1989 OF ACTIVE D	MDUPLICATED) RESIDENCE ZIP HRU SEP, 199	00 €)	0011EC	PAGE OFTES OFTES
TOTAL IMPATIENT CARE (HOSPITAL AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES IMPATIENT)	IMFECTIOUS DISEASE	M B D C C C C	MEUROLOGY	NUTRITIONAL	PULMOMARY/ RESPIRATORY		
ME MAS RESULRED) USER BEMEFICIARIES USER BEMEFICIARIES ADMISSIONS AVERAGE LEMGIH OF STAT AVERAGE LEMGIH OF STAT AVERAGE COVERMINENT COST AVERAGE GOVERMINENT COST AVERAGE G	5 . 0 . 0 . 0 . 0 . 0 . 0 . 0 . 0 . 0 .	% M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M	8 400 0 400 1 100 1 100 1 100 1 100 1 100 1 100 1 100	00000000	2 . 00 2 . 00 2 . 00 5 . 00 10	00000000	3 1 2 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5
A 1 E A 2 E	00000000		000000000	00000000	18.00 18.00	00000000	26 10.71 22.71 22.71 22.6899 15.907.78
MAS A SEUIRED) USER BENEFICIARIES ADNISSIONES ADNISSIONES ACEAGE LENGTH OF STA ACEAGE LENGTH OF STA ACEAGE CONFERMENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNMENT AND AVERAGE GOVERNMENT AND AVERAGE GOVERNMENT AND AVERAGE	4000 000 000 000 000 000 000	4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	1	~0000000000000000000000000000000000000	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	9.00 0.00 0.00 113 113 100 113 100 100 100 100 100 1	M M S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S
USER BENEFICIARIES ADMISSIONS HOSPITAL DAYS A VERAGE LENGTH OF STAY A VERAGE DAILY PATIENT LOAD TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST A VERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/ADMISSI	5 .00 11 .10 12 .280 3 .709 .480 3 .709 .480	10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	8 9 8 4 8 9 8 9 8 9 8 9 8 9 8 9 8 9 8 9	~0000000000000000000000000000000000000	9/4/ 6/4/4/ 6/4/4/4/4/4/4/4/4/4/4/4/4/4/4/4/4/4/4/4	9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 7.13 8.50 8.50 8.50 8.50 8.50 8.50 8.50 8.50	5 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4
	4						

* THE FOLLOWING CARE DOES MOT 'REQUIRE AM M.A.S.: CARE COVERED BY OTHER HEALTH INSURANCE, CARE IN A COLLEGE INFIRMARY, MURSING FACILITY, RESIDENTIAL TRFATMENT CENTER; CARE BY A CIVILIAM DOCTOR IN AN IMPATIENT MHSS MEDICAL TREATMENT FACILITY; CARE IN AN ALCOHOLIC TREATMENT FACILITY. ** CARE FOR BEMEFICIABLES RESIDING WITHIN THE LATCHMENT AREA OF AN INPATIENT MHSS MEDICAL TREATMENT FACILITY

TIME: 07:20:20	O23 - INPATIENT R FOR CAR	HAYS AH FT ORD EPONT (BASED O E RECEIVED FRO DEPENDENT	M BENEFICIARY M OCT 1989 S OF ACTIVE D	UNDUPLICATED) RESIDENCE ZIF THRU SEP, 199	00 €)	2001	ō
TOTAL INPATIENT CARE (HOSPITAL AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES INPATIENT)	DENTAL	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	6 Y M E C O L O 6 Y	CATEGORY OF CAR	PSYCHIATRY GROUP 1	P S Y C H I N H I	SPECIAL
NE SECTION OF SECTION	000	~-!	2	~ 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	4 V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V	3 3 2 4 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	8 8 9 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 0
ATIENT CARE PAIS SER BENETICIAN ES SEN BENETICIAN ES SENETICIAN ES SENETICIAN ES SENETICIAN ES SENETICIAN ES SENETICIAN ES SENETICIAN EN SENET	00000000	70 200 18,417 64,417 9,208,50	8 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00		2 2 4 2 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	69 209 69 209 8 5 209 15 45 1 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5	86.50 86.50 278.50 278.50 28.578 39.465.00
MAPATIEMT CARE ** USER BENEFICIARIES ADMISSIONS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY AVERAGE DATINGT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNMENT AVERAGE GOVER	00000000	298.327 200.337 298.337 309.237 3,242.73	WL 444 WL	8 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2	32 123 26, 96, 48 26, 28 28, 28 20, 768, 23 20, 768, 23 20, 768, 23
USER BEMEFICIARIES ADMISSIONS ADMISSIONS AVERAGE LENGTN OF STAY AVERAGE DAILY PATIENT LOAD TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT AND PATIE AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/AD AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/AD AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/AD	000. 000. 000. 000. 000.	3000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 00	3	\$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$	2	20.05 150.15 150.15 155.48 155.48 155.48 155.58 155.58	38 2962 19.73 19.73 557 557 576 576 576 576 576 576 576 576

MOTE: REFER TO PAGE 1 (SPECIFICATIONS PAGE) OF THIS REPORT FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE DATA WHICH APPEARS ON THIS REPORT.

DATE: 01 MAR 91 TIME: 07:20:20	INPATIENT R FOR CAR	E RECEIVED FROM	M OCT 1989 T	HRU SEP, 1990			SECRITS
	EAR, MOSE	GENERAL SURGERY	GORY OF CARE-S BEUROPO-	URGERY OR CARE	RELATED TO SUI THORACIC SURGERY	DROLOGY	GRAND TOTAL FOR ALL CATEGORIES
MERGERCY MEDICAL TREATHENT NO MAS REGUIRED USER GENEFICIARIES AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAT AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAT TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST/DAY AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/DAY AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/DAY AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/DAY	-0000	4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	201	N 000 1 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	00000000	2,00 2,00 2,377 2,377 2,377 2,377 1,188.50	331 1 30 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
PATIENT CARE ** O MAS REQUIRED) USER BENEFICIARIES HOSPITAL DAYS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/ADM AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/ADM	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	152 % 000 152 % 000 164 % 200 38,100,222 38,100,222	00000000	4000 4000 4100 6000	00000000	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	18
PATIENT CARE ** AS REQUIRED) USER BENEFICIARIES ADMISSIONS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY AVERAGE DAILY PATIENT LOAD TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST TOTAL PATIENT AND PATIENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNMENT AND PATIENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/ADMISSI AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/ADMISSI AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/ADMISSI	L .000	1	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	8 4 8 9 8 9 8 9 8 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	5 . 3 . 3 . 3 . 3 . 3 . 3 . 3 . 3 . 3 .	2, 20 4 15,004 15,004 15,004 7,515,417	2
SER DEMEFY I ARIES DMISSIONS DMISSIONS DMISSIONS SER DEMETH SER CEMETH VERAGE DAILY PATIENT COST OTAL GOVERNMENT COST OTAL GOVERNMENT AND PATIENT COST VERAGE GOVERNMENT COST VERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/ADMISSIO	165 34 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	2, 50 % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	0	2	2	20 2 3 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	E

NOTE: REFER TO PAGE 1 (SPECIFICATIONS PAGE) OF THIS REPORT FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE DATA WHICH APPEARS ON THIS REPORT.

	INPATIENT R FOR CAR	EPORT (BASED ON ERECEIVED FROM	CT, 1989	HRU SEP, 1990		-	SHUMINS
TOTAL INPATIENT CARE (HOSPITAL AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES INPATIENT)	ADVERSE I	A L L E R G Y	CARDIOLOGY (VASCULAR DISEASE)	OF CARE-INTERNAL DERNATOLOGY EN	MEDICINE	6ASTRO- ENTEROLOGY	MEMATOLOGY
NEW SERVINE STANDARD		00000000	4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	00000000	000:1	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	000.00.787,8
YO MAS WE COLLARD AND WAS WE COLLARD AND WEST OF COLLARD AND WEST OF COLLARD AND WEST OF COLLARD AND C	00000000	00000000	2	000000000	-0000 mm00	m 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
MAS REQUIRED OF STANDS OF	00000000	00000000	2	000000000	00000000	. 000 . 000 7 6 0 7 6 0 . 000	6 5 5 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6
SER BENEFICIARIES SER BENEFICIARIES DMISSIONS OSPITAL DAYS VERAGE LENGTH OF STAY VERAGE LENGTH OF STAY OTAL GOVENNENT COST OTAL GOVENNENT COST VERAGE GOVENNENT COST/AD	000000000	00000000	880004 80004 00004 00004 0000 0000 0000	000000000	**************************************	4.00 6.102 1.02 3.222 3.222 3.084.00	7.00 7.00 7.00 1.4.00 1.750 36.63 36.63

NOTE: REFER TO PAGE 1 (SPECIFICATIONS PAGE) OF THIS REPORT FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE DATA WHICH APPEARS ON THIS REPORT.

### ### ##############################	N PATIENT P	PORT CBASED ON PRECENCE OF PRE	**CC **CC **CC **CC **CC **CC **CC **C	MEN SEP. 1999		COLLEC	TION PAGE 2 HOMINS CONTACTOR
TOTAL IMPATIENT CARE (MOSPITAL AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES IMPATIENT)	IMFECTIOUS DISEASE		MEUROLOGY	OF CARE-INTERNA	AL MEDICIME PULMOMARY/ RESPIRATORY	RHEUMATOLOGY	
THE RECENCY MEDICAL TREATHERT OF ASSESSED AND ASSESSED AS	00 00	000000000	W & H & H & H & H & H & H & H & H & H &		3, 40, 70, 80, 80, 80, 80, 80, 80, 80, 80, 80, 8	000000000	H
NO	00000000	-0000000000000000000000000000000000000	2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000	000000000	3, 2, 00 0 1 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3		000000000000000000000000000000000000000
	000. 000. 000. 000. 000.	1	000%	000000000	4 8 4 8 4 8 4 8 4 8 4 8 4 8 4 8 4 8		00000000
NAME OF STREET O		17.00 17.00 3.12.00 3.251 5.18.00 3.251.00	4 . 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	00044	28	40000000000000000000000000000000000000	1 8 WW 1 1 8 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
* THE FOLLOWING CARE DOES NOT REGICARE COVERED BY OTHER HEALTH IN CIVILIAN DOCTOR IN AN INPATIENT * CARE FOR BENEFICIARIES RESIDING OTE: REFER TO PAGE 1 (SPECIFICATI	AMCE, CARE TRESS.	A COLLEGE INF EATMENT FACILI HMENT AREA OF S REPORT FOR C	IRMARY, MURS TY, CARE IN AM IMPATIENT LARIFICATION	ING FACILITY, RAN ALCOHOLIC TE	RESIDENTIAL TR REATMENT FACIL TREATMENT FACI HICH APPEARS O	EATMENT CENTER; IIY. LITI. N THIS REPORT.	CARE BY A

REPORT MO: F3130-001 DATE: 01 MAR 91 TIME: 07:20:20	1 NPATIENT R FOR CAR	HAYS AH FT ORD EPORT (BASED O	N BENEFICIARY N OCT, 1989 ETIREES	NDUPLICATED) RESIDENCE ZIP HRU SEP, 199	00	0000	PAGE ECTION PERIOD 15 MONTHS
	DENTAL	0 B S T E T R I C S	6 YNE COLO 6 Y	CATEGORY OF CAL	PSYCHA 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	PS4 CH	SPECIAL PEDIATRICS
THE STATE OF THE S	0000000	00000000	00000000	00000000	2	2 . 0 0 2 3 4 6 2 8 6 2 6 2	00000000
TAIR REPORT TO THE THE REPORT TO THE REPORT	00000000	00000000	00000000	200044 000044 00044	000000000	000000000	00000000
PATIENT CARE ** NSER BENEFICIARIES USER BENEFICIARIES ADMISSIONS AVERAGE LENGIN OF STAY AVERAGE OVERNIENT COST TOTAL PATIENT COST TOTAL PATIENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST AVERNMENT COST AVER AGE GOVERNMENT COST AVER AGE	00000000	00000000		00000000	8 040401 8 040401 8 040401 8 0404000000000000000000000000000000000	2 8 2 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	
ND TCTAL ND TCTAL DMISSIONS OSPITAL DATES OSPITAL DATES OSPITAL DATES OSPITAL DATES OTAL GOVERNMENT COST OTAL GOVERNMENT COST OTAL GOVERNMENT COST OTAL GOVERNMENT COST VERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/AD VERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/AD	00000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000000			4	5 2 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	00000000

NOTE: REFER TO PAGE 1 (SPECIFICATIONS PAGE) OF THIS REPORT FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE DATA WHICH APPEARS ON THIS REPORT. CARE COVERED BY OTHER HEALTH INSURANCE; CARE IN A COLLEGE INFIRMARY, NURSING FACILITY, RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT CIVILLAN DOCTOR IN AN INPATIENT MHSS MEDICAL TREATMENT FACILITY; CARE IN AN ALCOHOLIC TREATMENT FACILITY. ** CARE FOR BENEFICIARIES RESIDING WITHIN THE CATCHMENT AREA OF AN INPATIENT MHSS MEDICAL TREATMENT FACILITY.

REPORT NO: FS130-001 DATE: 01 MAR 91 TIME: 07:20:20	0 1 0	PORT (BASED RECEIVED F	BENEFICIARY OCT, 1989 Tirees	MRU SEP, 1990	<u> </u>		NONTHS
TOTAL INPATIENT CARE (HOSPITAL AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES INPATIENT)	EAR THROSE	GENERAL CATES	GORY OF CARE-S MEURO- SURGERY	C R G E R Y O R C A R E	RELATED TO SUR THORACIC SURGERT	UROLOGY	GRAND TOTAL FOR ALL CATEGORIES
TERGENCY MEDICAL TREATMENO MASS REBUIRED) USER BEREFICIARIES ADMINSTRATE DAYS AVERAGE LENGIN OF STAY AVERAGE LENGIN OF STAY TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST	00000000	10.00 10.00 10.00 10.00 11.72 11.72 7.072 7.072 7.072 7.072	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	2 2 3 3 4 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9
TO A TAIL TO CARE A SERVICE BENEFICIARIES BENEFICIARIES BENEFICIARIES A VURAGE LENGTH OF STANDER CONTROLL	00000000	1	2 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	2 . 00 2 . 00 2 . 00 5 . 00 7 8 2 7 8 2 7 8 2 7 8 2 7 8 2 7 8 3 8 5 0 0 0 0		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	2.45 2.45 35.104 123.104 158.232 3.191.27
NAS REGUL RED NUSER REQULRED NUSER REQULRED NUSER REGULRED NUSER R	-0000-w0001	4 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	8 5.50 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0	0 - 0 4 8 0 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	4	26 26 178 8 .42 138 .46 185 .248 6 .345 .488
RAMD TOTAL ADMISSIONS ADMISSIONS ADMISSIONS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY AVERAGE DAILY PATIENT LOAD TOTAL PATIENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/DAY AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/DAY	·	23 23 25 27 20 30 81 80 85 86 86 86 86 86 86 86 86 86 86 86 86 86	10000000000000000000000000000000000000	2	7.07 10.378 10.378 10.378 10.378.00	411 1100 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000	122 71 71 71 8402 5,402 1,10 1,10 1,10 1,10 1,10 1,10 1,10 1,

NOTE: REFER TO PAGE 1 (SPECIFICATIONS PAGE) OF THIS REPORT FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE DATA WHICH APPEARS ON THIS REPORT. CARE COVERED BY OTHER HEALTH INSURANCE, CARE IN A COLLEGE INFIRMARY, MURSING FACILITY, RESIDENTIAL TREATHENT CIVILIAN DOCTOR IN AN INPATIENT MHSS MEDICAL TREATMENT FACILITY, CARE IN AN ALCOHOLIC TREATHENT FACILITY. ** CARE FOR BENEFICIARIES RESIDING WITHIN THE CATCHMENT AREA OF AN INPATIENT MHSS MEDICAL TREATMENT FACILITY.

REPORT MO: FS130-001 Date: 01 mar 91 Time: 07:20:20	NPATIENT R FOR CAR	HAYS AH FT ORD EPORT (BASED C E RECEIVED FRO DEPENDENTS OF	1001 1989 0 089 0 08	MDUPLICATED) RESIDENCE ZIPCODE) HRU SEP, 1990 CEASED			CTION PERIOD:
MAL.	A A D C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	ALLERGY	CARDIOLOGY CARDIOLOGY CASCULAR DISEASE)	OF CARE-INTERNAL MED DERMATOLOGY ENDOCR	I C I N E	6 A S T R O C T C T C T C T C T C T C T C T C T C	MEMATOLOGY
NO MASS REQUIRED OF TREATMENT ON ON THE PROPERTY OF STANDARD OF ST	100000 100000 100000	M SSEA!		000 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	00000000	4 - 7 80 0 4 4 4 4 7 1 1 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	000000000
ATIEMT CARE * MAS REGUIRED) SER BENEFICIARIES DRISSIONS OSFITAL DAYS VERAGE LEMGTH OF STAY VERAGE DAILY PATIENT LOAD OTAL GOVERNMENT COST OTAL GOVERNMENT COST VERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/ADMISS VERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/ADMISS VERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/ADMISS	-000044m00	2000 000 000 000 000 000	41.01 41.01 41.01 92.050 92.060 87.070 87.070	-0000 4-v00			00000001
A TERM TO THE STATE TO THE STAT	00000000	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	3.22 3.22 85.22 85.552 95.552 95.552 77.22	## # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #	20000	81 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2
RAND TOTAL USE BENEFICIARIES ADMISSIONS HOSPITAL DAYS AVERAGE LEGITH OF STAY AVERAGE DAILY PATIENT LOAD TOTAL GOVERNHENT COST TOTAL GOVERNHENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNHENT COST/ADMISSION AVERAGE GOVERNHENT COST/ADMISSION	7 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	3.50 2.01 4.115 5.05 5.05 5.05 5.05 5.05 5.05 5.05	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	44 2000 1,4 2000 1,000 1,000 1,000 1,000	N4 00044800	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	447.71 2.2.47 447.7.71 6.00.68 6.00.68 6.00.68

OTAL IMPATIENT CARE	INTALIEN - NE FOR CARE	EPORT (BASED OF ERECEIVED FROM DEPENDENTS OF	CT 1989	HRU SEP, 1990 CEASER		200	SHLEON
OMAL	M F E C I I O U S		MEUROLOGY	F CARE-INTERN NUTRITIONAL	AL MEDICIME PULMONARY/ RESPIRATORY		
MO MAS REQUIRED AUGENT REPRENT NO MAS REQUIRED AUGUS RESTRENT RESTREMENTS SIONS AVERAGE LENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT AND PATIENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT AND PATIENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST AVERAGE	00 001	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2		20 20 11 4 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	000000000	
NO MAS REQUIRED OUSER BENEFICIARIES ADDISSIONS ADDISSIONS AVERAGE ENGTM OF STATICATE TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNMENT AND PATIE AVERAGE GOVERNMENT AND PATIE AVERAGE GOVERNMENT AND PATIE AVERAGE GOVERNMENT AND PATIE	030000000	00000000		00000000	3 . 4 . 4 . 4 . 4 . 4 . 4 . 4 . 4 . 4 .	80000000000000000000000000000000000000	2.00 2.00 2.00 3.00 3.00 1,72 0.00 1,72
AS REGULATED) USER BELLIED) USER BELLIED) ADDISIONS AVERAGE LENGTA AVERAGE LENGTA TOTAL GOVERNTENT COST TOTAL GOVERNTENT COST AVERAGE GOVE		3, 6, 00 3, 8, 75 13, 875 13, 875 14, 75 15, 75 16,	00000000	00000000	5 . 25 . 25 . 25 . 25 . 25 . 25 . 25 .	9.09 9.09 10,777 10,001 43,840 6,944.75	
AND TOTAL USER BENEFICIARIES ADMISSIONS SOSPITAL DAYS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY AVERAGE DAILY PATIENT LOAD TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST A'TOTAL GOVERNMENT AND PATIENT C'S A'TOTAL GOVERNMENT AND PATIENT C'S RERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/ADMISS		4	2	, 000 , 255 , 255 , 328 , 588 , 000	35 67 77 87 72 87 82 82 81 81 81 81 81 81 81 81 81 81	9 .00 28 .50 20 .00 21,265 7,086,610 7,086,625	1.000 1.000

COTE: REFER TO PAGE 1 (SPECIFICATIONS PAGE) OF THIS REPORT FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE DATA WHICH APPEARS ON THIS REPORT.

TIME: 07:20:20	FORCAR	E RECEIVED FRO	M OCT, 1989 RETIRED OR D	THRU SEP, 1991 ECEASED	0		I Z
TOTAL INPATIENT CARE (HOSPITAL AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES INPATIENT)	DENTAL	0 0 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	6 Y N E C O L O 6 Y	CATEGORY OF CAL	PSYCHIATRY 680UP 1		SPECIAL
MERGEMCY MEDICAL TREATMENT NO MAS MEDUIRED) USE MENEFICIARIES ADMISSIONS HOSPITAL DAYS AVERAGE LENGTM OF STAY AVERAGE DAILLY PATIENT LOAD TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/ADM AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/ADM AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/ADM	00 00	•	20000000000000000000000000000000000000	000000000	2 % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	2 1.00 1.00 2.171 2.557 2.557 2.557 2.71.50	00000000
ATIENT CARE & DAIS REQUIRED) SER BENEFICIARIES DAISSIONS OSPITAL DAYS VERAGE LENGTH OT ST OTAL GOVERNMENT CON OTAL GOVERNMENT CON OTAL GOVERNMENT CON VERAGE GOVERNMENT AND VERA	000000000	- w 4	4	000	8 6 . 17 2 8 6 . 17 2 8 6 . 17 2 8 6 . 17 2 8 6 . 18 6 7 5 8 6 8 8 8 6 8 8 8 6 8 8 8 6 8	4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	00000000
MAS REQUIRED) USER BERNEFICIARIES ADRISSIONS ANDRISSIONS AVERAGE LENGTH DF STAY AVERAGE LENGTH DF STAY AVERAGE COVERNMENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST AVERAGE COVERNMENT COST	000000000	2	2	2 2 2 2 2 2 3 3 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	
AAND TOTAL USER GENEFIC IARIES ADMISSIONS AVERAGE DAILY PATIE TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT AN AVERAGE GOVERNMENT AN AVERAGE GOVERNMENT AN		18	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	40 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80	2 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	

MOTE: REFER TO PAGE 1 (SPECIFICATIONS PAGE) OF THIS REPORT FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE DATA WHICH APPEARS ON THIS REPORT.

EPORT NO: F\$130-001 ATE: 01 MAR 91 IME: 07:20:20	O23 - H IMPATIENT RE FOR CARE	AYS AH FT ORD PORT (BASED OF RECEIVED FROI DEPENDENTS OF	CANEFICIARY OCT, 1989 T	NDUPLICATED) RESIDENCE ZIPC HRU SEP, 1990 CEASED	006)		CTION PERIOD:
OTAL IMPATIENT CARE MOSPITAL AND PROFESSIONAL ERVICES INPATIENT)	EAN THROSE	SURERAL SURERAL SURERAL	GORY OF CARE-IS	C C C C C C C C C C	RELATED TO SUR THORACIC SURGERY	1	GRAND TOTAL FOR ALL CATEGORIES
R G E M C T M E M D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D	1, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4,	80 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1000 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4		00000000	8 68 3 8 68 5 . 00 3 7 2 . 00 10 9 . 14 7 1 10 5 7 1 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
0 AA1 MAS REGULRED) USER BEREFICIARIES USER BEREFICIARIES MOSPITAL AVERAGE LENGTM OF STAY AVERAGE DAILY PATIENT COST TOTAL FOVERMENT COST TOTAL FOVERMENT COST TOTAL FOVERMENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/ADMISSICA	00 001	2 1 2 1 2 1 2 2 1 2 2 1 2 2 1 2 2 2 1 2 2 2 2 1 2	27.000000000000000000000000000000000000	8 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2		2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
AS REGULACE AS REGULACE AS REGULACE AND REGULACE AS RE	2000 0000 0000 0000 0000 0000	3 . 2 2 7 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	80 W+480 W+480 W-4040 W-4040 W-6080 W	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2	7, 7, 000 % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
NE TOTAL SER DENEFICIARIES DRISSIONS OSPITAL DAS VERAGE LENGTH OF STAY VERAGE DAILY PATIENT LOAD OTAL GOVERNMENT COST OTAL GOVERNMENT AND PATIENT CO VERAGE GOVERNMENT COST VERAGE COST		8 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	20 7 7 7 7 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	2	0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0.000 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

EPORT NO: F>130-001 ATE: 01 MAR 91 IME: 07:20:20	ATIENT R FOR CAR	HATS AN PLOND EPORT (BASED O ERECEIVED FE OTAL ALL CATEG	N BENEFICIARY N OCT 1989 ORIES OF BENE	RESIDENCE ZIP HRU SEP, 199 ICIARIES	D E)	נ מר ר ב	S TONITS
OTAL INPATIENT CARE HOSPITAL AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES INPATIENT)	A D C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	ALLERGY	CARDIOLOGY (VASCULAR DISEASE)	OF CARE-INTERNAL DERMATOLOGY EN	MEDICINE	6ASTRO	HEMATOLOGY
ERGENCY MEDICAL TREATHENT ON AS REQUIRED) USER BENEFICIARIES ADMISSIONS ANDRISTAL DAYS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST TOTAL PATIENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			3 . 50 3 . 50 3 . 50 3 . 50 3 . 50 3 . 50 5	W
ATIENT CARE ** SER BENEFICIARD) SER BENEFICIARIES DN11341005 ** VERAGE CENGTM OF STAT VERAGE GOVERNENT COST VE	MOOOO 7∜∜OO	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	000041000	0000 €0F100	2.00 2.00 3.106 8.444 11,553.00	8 8 9 41 8 8 0 1 8 8 0 1 8 8 0 1 8 8 0 0 1 8 8 0 0 1 8 1 8 8 8 1
TATIENT CARE ** USER BEWEFICIARIES USER BEWEFICIARIES AVERAGE LEMETH OF STAY AVERAGE DALLY FAILENT LOAD TOTAL GOVERNENT COST TOTAL FAIRENT COST TOTAL FAIRENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNENT COST/AD AVERAGE GOVERNENT COST/AD	00000000	2	2 2 2 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	X	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	18 5.57 39.506 4.48.71 5.65.28 1.014.51	10 2 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 2 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
AND TOTAL USER BENEFICIARIES ADMISSIONS HOSPITAL DAY AVERAGE ENGTH OF STAY AVERAGE ENILY PATIENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/A AVERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/A	18 4 18 18 18 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	12 12 13 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	00000000000000000000000000000000000000	4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	2	21 28 4.08 78,23 78,130 20,130 3,730,190	18

NOTE: REFER TO PAGE 1 (SPECIFICATIONS PAGE) OF THIS REPORT FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE DATA WHICH APPEARS ON THIS REPORT.

PORT MO: FS130-001 TE: 01 MAR 91 ME: 07:20:20	O23 - IMPATIENT R FOR CAR	HATS AH FT ORD FORT (BASED OI E RECEIVED FROI OTAL ALL CATEG	EMEFICIARY CT 1989 ES OF BENE	MDUPLICATED) HRU SEP, 1999 ICIARIES	(300	001160	CTION PERIOD:
1014 12941 1014	IMFECTIOUS DISEASE		1	MUTRITIOMAL	0 4 1	RHEUMATOLOGY	# H H O I
THE REGETS OF THE PARENTS OF THE PAR	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2,000 2,000 3,000 5,000 5,000 5,000 5,000 5,000	20 10 6.00 6.00 10 14,10 14,10 72,607 5,841.00	2 00 00 1397 7275, 1	2	00000000	4 M 9 M 1 M 1 M 1 M 1 M 1 M 1 M 1 M 1 M 1
MO MAS MEGUINED) USER SEMEFICIARIS USER SEMEFICIARIES ANDMISIOS ANDMISIOS AVERAGE DATIC TOTAL FATIENT COST TOTAL GOVERNENT COST AVERAGE GOVERNENT COST/AD	00000000	3	400 000 000 000 000 000	00000000	4 5 4 5 4 5 4 5 4 5 4 5 4 5 4 5 4 5 4 5	000 	2 2 2 3 2 3 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3
MAS REQUIRED 6 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	60000000000000000000000000000000000000	0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	14 5 5 11,26 57,539 8,339 11,50,68	~0000000000000000000000000000000000000	01 02 05 05 05 05 05 05 05 05 05 05 05 05 05	9.00 9.00 32.567 16.704 6.513 6.513	124 944 95-15 354-605 356-625 3777-114
UNDER 1011 1011 1011 1011 1011 1011 1011 10	2	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	120 - 116 120 - 120 120 - 121 120 -	000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000	2	9	
* THE FOLLOWING CARE DOES MOT REGUIN CARE COVERED BY OTHER HEALTH INSUR CIVILIAM DOCTOR IM AM IMPATIENT MM CARE FOR BENEFICIARIES RESIDING MI	E AM M.A.S.: ANCE, CARE IS SS MEDICAL THIN THE CAT	N A COLLEGE IN REATWENT FACIL CHMENT AREA OF	FITTE CARE IN STAN IN PATIENT	ING FACILITY RAN ALCOHOLIC TR	ESIDENTIAL TR EATMENT FACIL REATMENT FACI	EATMENT CENTER; ITY. LITY.	CARE BY A

NOTE; REFER TO FAGE 1 (SPECIFICATIONS PAGE) OF THIS REPORT FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE DATA WHICH APPEARS ON THIS REFORT.

## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ##		D TO SURGERY	68 A N O 1 O 1 A 1 O 1 A 1 O 1 A 1 O 1 A 1 O 1 A 1 O 1 A 1 C 1 C A 1 E 5 O 8 1 E 5 O 1
ATIENT CARE ** SER BENEFILIARIES DMISSIONS OSPITAL DAYS OSPITAL OSPITA	8 0 2 8 8 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2, 2, 00 2, 2, 00 3, 1, 00 4, 00 5, 00 6, 00 1, 00	8 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1
ATIENT CARE ** SER GENEFICIARIES DRISSIONS SOFITAL DAYS SCRAFF CONTROL STAY 1.00 S.16 8.4 1.00 S.16 8.4 1.00 S.16 8.4 20 SPITAL DAYS 2 1.24 1.00 S.16 8.4 20 SPITAL DAYS 2 1.24 1.00 S.16 8.4 20 SPITAL DAYS 2 1.24 1.00 S.16 8.4	2,705.00 2,5705.00 2,705.00 2,705.00	\$ 20 6.00 6.00 7.587 1.587 4.174 8.106 1.16	2
017AL 60 V PR	80 44 84 84 84 84 84 84 84 84 84 84 84 84	2	2
NE TOTAL DHISSIONS SER WERE FICIARIES DHISSIONS OSPITAL DAYS OSPITAL DAYS OSPITAL DAYS OSPITAL DAYS OSPITAL DAYS OTAL GOVERNMENT COST OTAL GOVERNMENT COST VERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/DAY SASS VERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/DAY SASS VERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/DAY SASS VERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/DAY SASS OTAL GOVERNMENT COST/DAY OTAL GOVERNMENT CO	40.00 40.00 40.00 40.00 40.00 40.00 40.00 40.00	2	4

EPORT NO: FS130-001 ATE: 01 MAR 91 IME: 07:20:20	O23 - MAYS AH INPATIENT REPORT (E FOR CARE RECEIV	PASED ON BENEFICIARY CONTOCTION BASED ON BENEFICIARY ESIDEN VED FROM OCT, 1989 THRU SE	MCE 21P(00E)	COLLECTION PERIO 15 MONTHS
AL INPATION OF STATE	DEPENDENTS OF ACTIVE DUTY	RETIREES	OSPITAL DEPARTMENTS DEPENDENTS OF RETIRED OR DECENSED	TOTAL ALL CATEGORIES OF BEWEFICIARIES
NCT MEDICAL TREATMENT SECULINED S SSIONS SSIONS SSIONS SSIONS TAL DAYS AGE EDAILY AGE EDAILY L GOVERNMENT COST AGE COVERNMENT COST AGE COST AGE COST AGE COST AGE AGE COST AG	- M 100001 M 4-01 M 7-01 M 4-01	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	068 055 057 057 057 057 057 057 057 057 057	87 87 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8
NAS REGUIRED SER GENEFICIARIES DELISSIONS S DERISSIONS S DERISSIONS S DERISSIONS S VERAGE LEMETH OF STAY VERAGE GOVERNMENT COST OTAL GOVERNMENT CO	2	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	8 14 2 1,18 1,18 1,18 1,18 1,18 1,18 1,18 1,	20 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
ATIENT CARE ** SER BENEFICIARIES DMISSIONS OSPITAL DAYS OTAL GOVERNMENT COST OTAL GOVERNMENT COST VERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/DAY OFFICE GOVERNMENT COST/DAY OFFICE GOVERNMENT COST/DAY	2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2	20	8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
SER BENEFICIARIES BRISSIONS OSPITAL VERAGE LENGTH OF STAY VERAGE DA.LY PATIENT COST OTAL GOVERNMENT COST OTAL GOVERNMENT COST VERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/DAMIS VERAGE GOVERNMENT COST/DAMIS	X	88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88	0, 1 0, 1 0, 1 0, 1 0, 1 0, 1 0, 1 0, 1	950 950 950 950 950 950 950 950

APPENDIX H (HEALTH CARE SUMMARY)

		HEALTH CARE SUM CARE RECEIVED F 023 - HAYS AH				COLLECTION PER	IOD: I5 MGNI UNDUPLICAT
AO REA	VERSE CTIONS	CATEGORY OF CAR	CARDIOLOGY (VASCULAR DISEASE)	MEDICINE **** DERMATOLOGY	ENDOCRINOLOGY	GASTRO- ENTEROLOGY	HEMATOLO176
BENEFICIARIES NT OF ACT DUTY SPONSOR IREE NT OF RET OR OEC SPONSOR HOSPITAL AONISSIONS TAL OAYS TENGEN OF STAY LOAYS	6 2 0 4 6	8 0 2 2 2 2	47 7 18 22 254	1 0 0 1 1	1 0 0 1 5	19 10 2 7 21 85	1.
GE DAILY PATIENT LOAD	26 4.33 0.07 10,083 2,471 12,554 1,680.50 587.81	29 3.22 0.08 15,097 1,870 16,967 1,6744 520.59	254 4.31 0.70 458,790 52,961 7,776.10 1,806.26	I.00 0.00 2,924 125 3,049 2,924.00 2,924.00	5,105	4.05 0.23 57,276 11,437 68,713 2,721.43	15.2 0 5 169,63 11,746 21,211.0 1,390.8
PATIENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES		11		c	10		
BENEFICIARIES NT OF ACT DUTY SPONSOR IREE NT OF RET OR DEC SPONSOR R OF VISITS R OF NON-VISIT SERVICES GOVERNMENT COST PATIENT COST GOVT AND PATIENT COST	14 10 0 22 3,622 1,423	3,2638 3,4,18	9259 9259 9259 9258 958269 964 964 182 182	1,285 2,102	2, 8973 2, 8973 2, 8973 2, 8973 2, 8973 2, 8973 2, 8973 2, 8973	3 + 2 2 6 7 1 2 5 0 1 5 5 0 0 1 5 5 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 0 0 0	15,87 2,72 13,56
TAL INPATIENT SERVICES	5,053	4,170		2,102	4,130	27,752	10,50
BENEFICIARIES NT OF ACT DUTY SPONSOR IREE NT OF RET OR OEC SPONSOR GOVERNHENT COST FATTENT COST GOVT AND PATTENT COST OVT COST PER ADMISSION OVT COST PER DAY	18 11 0 7 13,710 3,898 17,698 2,285.00 527.31	12 7 0 18,359 2,806 21,165 2,033.07	109 275 455 565,637 128,630 694,244 9,586.68 2,226.83	5 0 4,209 4,209 5,151 4,209.00	10 5 2 3 1,275 7,235 5,960.00 1,192:00	26 7 11 78,334 20,130 98,464 3,730.19 921.58	185,5, 14,5,2 200,04 25,190.7 1,520.7
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES BENEFICIARIES NIOF ACT OUTY SPONSOR	642	444	1,026	1,662	407	1.016] .
NT OF ACT OUTY SPONSOR IREE NI OF RET OR DEC SPONSOR R OF VISITS R OF MONI-VISIT SERVICES GOVERNMENT COST PATTENT COST GOVI AND PATTENT COST OVI COST PER VISIT	517 297 692 698 78,4750 29,526 113.40	273 133 1,3418 1,4388 255,2869 7886.97	284 3367 1,968 2,691 207,614 139,6837 105,249	1,662 1,622 1,987 2,251 140,780 54,391 195,171 70.85	118 96 194 830 852 56,889 44,829 101,718 68.54	1,557 1,179 1,179 1,539 182,793 65,459 248,257 155,04	137,32 22,01 100,01
ITPATIENT CARE COST SHARED AS INPA	TILNT						
BENEFICIARIES HT OF ACT DUTY SPONSOR TRET HT OF RET OR DEC SPONSOR GOVERNMENT COST PATIENT COST GOVE AND PATIENT COST	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	
NAL INPATIENT AND OUTPATIENT CARE		665	1 041	1 446	(.1.7	I 0.79	1.
BENEFICIARIES NT OF ACT DUTY SPONSOR IREE IT OF RET OR DEC SPONSOR GOVERNOENT COST PATIENT COST GOVT AND PATIENT COST REFER TO PAGE 1 SPECIFICATIONS P	92,185 24,448 116,633 AGE OF Th	274 39 133 71,747 28,085 99,832 HIS REPORT FOR	1,061 295 347 420 773,228 268,314 1,041,542 CLARIFICATION	1,664 1,108 162 396 144,988 55,333 200,321	413 122 97 195 62,849 46,104 108,953 WHICH APPEARS C	1,039 670 108 263 261,132 85,589 346,721 ON THIS REPORT.	322,87 37,17 360.05

HR085-007 (OHRJ6Q) RUN DATE: 29 JAN 1991 RUN TIME: 16:20:07 MODE: 7B, BENE ZIP

CHAMPUS HEALTH CARE SUMMARY BY PRIMARY DIAGNOSIS BASEO ON CARE RECEIVED FROM OCT 1989 THRU SEP 1990 023 - HAYS AH FT ORD, CA

COLLECTION PERIOD: 1

01

Impatient Hospital Services
USER BENEFICIARIES 3
TOTAL HOSPITAL ADMISSIONS # HOSPITAL DAYS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY (DAYS) SOOD ## HOSPITAL DAYS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY (DAYS) ## AVERAGE LANGTH ## AVER
TOTAL HOSPITAL ADMISSIONS ##GSPITAL DAYS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY (DAYS) SOOD ##GSPITAL DAYS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY (DAYS) ##GSPITAL DAYS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY (DAYS) ##GSPITAL DAYS ##GS
UPPATIENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES UPPATIENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES UPPATIENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES State of the patient of act outy sponsor State of the patient of act outy sponsor State of the patient of act outy sponsor State of the patient of the patient of act outy sponsor State of the patient cost State of the patient of the pati
UPPATIENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES UPPATIENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES UPPATIENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES State of the patient of act outy sponsor State of the patient of act outy sponsor State of the patient of act outy sponsor State of the patient of the patient of act outy sponsor State of the patient cost State of the patient of the pati
UPPATIENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES UPPATIENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES UPPATIENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES State of the patient of act outy sponsor State of the patient of act outy sponsor State of the patient of act outy sponsor State of the patient of the patient of act outy sponsor State of the patient cost State of the patient of the pati
UPPATIENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES UPPATIENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES UPPATIENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES State of the patient of act outy sponsor State of the patient of act outy sponsor State of the patient of act outy sponsor State of the patient of the patient of act outy sponsor State of the patient cost State of the patient of the pati
UPPATIENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES UPPATIENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES UPPATIENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES State of the patient of act outy sponsor State of the patient of act outy sponsor State of the patient of act outy sponsor State of the patient of the patient of act outy sponsor State of the patient cost State of the patient of the pati
DEPNI OF RET OR DEC SPONSOR 1 3 387 4
DEPNI OF RET OR DEC SPONSOR 1 2 3 387 4
III TOTAL INPATIENT SERVICES
III TOTAL INPATIENT SERVICES
III TOTAL INPATIENT SERVICES
USER BENEFICIARIES 10 14 37 4 98 12 DEPNT OF ACT DUTY SPONSOR 8 10 20 2 30 1 RETTREE 1 2 7 1 33 4 DEPNT OF RET OR DEC SPONSOR 1 3 10 1 35 7 TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST 12:103 76,868 120,175 1,601 263,613 33,599
RETTREE OF ACT DOTT SPONSOR 1 1 2 1 3 1 1 3 5 7 1 1 3 5 7 1 1 3 5 7 1 1 3 5 7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
10 TAL GOVERNHENT COST 12,103 76,868 120,175 1,601 263,613 33,599
TUTAL PATIENT COST 1,656 17,216 25,444 375 70,929 23,843
10TAL GOVERNMENT COST 12.103 76,868 120,175 1,601 263,613 33,599 10TAL PATTENT COST 1,656 17,216 25,444 1,576 33,599 23,843 10TAL GOVT AND PATTENT COST 13,764 94,084 145,619 1,976 33,4,542 57,442 4,084 145,619 1,976 33,4,542 57,442 4,084 145,619 1,976 33,4,542 57,442 4,084 1,085 1,
AVG GOVT COST PER DAY 807.20 1,182.58 1,035.99 0.00 1,226.11 746.64 IV OUTPATIENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
DEPNT OF ACT OUTY SPONSOR 716 32 380 21 1,118 61 RETURE 8 35 9 88 2 252 94
DEPNI OF RET OR DEC SPONSOR
NUMBER OF MOULVICIT SERVICES 774 204 1 407 27 15 440 970
101AL GUY! AND PAILEN! CUS! 102,756 \$7,171 202,052 2,461 308,991 91,789
AVG GOVT COST PER VISIT 75.48 122.16 111.12 57.12 91.93 62.09 V OUTPATIENT CARE COST SHARED AS INPATIENT
0EPNT OF ACT DUTY SPONSOR 0
DEDNIT OF DET OD DEC SPONSOD O O O O O
10TAL GOVERNMENT COST 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
VI TOTAL INPATIENT AND OUTPATIENT CARE
USER BENEFICIARIES 872 59 671 31 1,897 304 DEPNI OF ACT DUTY SPONSOR 723 37 387 22 1,136 62 RETIREE OF ACT DUTY SPONSOR 35 10 30 262 96
TUTAL GUVERNMENT COST 88,640 102,888 269,412 3,486 485,158 92,524 101AL PATTENT COST 27,879 28,367 78,259 951 158,375 56,708
TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST 88,640 102,888 269,412 3,486 485,158 92,524 101AL PATTENT COST 27,879 28,367 78,259 951 158,375 56,708 TOTAL GOVT AND PATTENT COST 116,519 131,255 86,708 NOTE: REFER TO PAGE 1 (SPECIFICATIONS PAGE) OF THIS REPORT.

PATIENT HOSPITAL SERVICES	DENTAL	OBSTETRICS	GYNECOLOGY	OPHTHALMOLOGY	GROUP 1	GROUP 2	PEDIATRI
BENEFICIARIES NT OF ACT OUTY SPONSOR IREE	0 0 0 0	106	25 21 0	3	47 26	34 28 2	
HOCELTAL ACRECTORS	0	112 307	25 100	2	14 52 1,096	34 80 5	
TAL DAYS GE LENGTH OF STAY (DAYS) GE DAILY PATIENT LOAD GOVERNMENT COST PATIENT COST GOVI AND PATIENT COST	0.00 0.00 0	208,435 208,435 8,997 217,432 1,861.03	4.00 0.27 71,831 6,280 78,111 2,873.24 718.31	1.67 0.01 8,420 8,795	11,008 3,000 462,841 45226 508,067 8,900.79 422.30	23.68 2.21 216,406 22,125 238,1531 6,364.88	470,1 470,1 480,
GOVI AND PATIENT COST OVI COST PER ADMISSION OVI COST PER DAY	0.00	678.94	2,873.24	2,806.67 1,684.00	422.30	6,364.88 268.83	3I,778 1,610
PATIENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES							
BEHEFICIARIES NT OF ACT DUTY SPONSOR IREE NT OF REFOR DEC SPONSOR R OF VISITS P OF NON-VISIT SERVICES COVERNIENT COST PATIENT COST GOVT AND PATIENT COST	1 0 0 1 1,315 1,315	240 224 0 17 119 1,456 160,171 256,655	48 35 0 13 242 31,627 29,002	10 10 10,997 12,104 23,101	37 6 6 37 3 28 20 20 33 33 22 33	29 19 55 1246 8,149 19,126	83, 15,
TAL INPATIENT SERVICES	1,515	216,826	60,629	23,101	33,224	7,207	70,1
RENEFICIARIES NT OF ACT DUTY SPONSOR	1	259 242	52 38	12	59 32 10	47 33 6	
TT OF RET OR DEC SPONSOR GOVERNMENT COST PATIENT COST GOVT AND PATIENT COST OVT COST PER ADMISSION OVT COST PER OAY	1,315 0,315 0,00 0,00	368,605 65,652 434,257 3,291.12 1,200.67	103,459 35,282 138,741 4,138.36 1,034.59	19,417 12,479 31,896 6,472.33 3,883.40	18 491,051 50,239 541,290 9,443.29 448.04	224,555 23,245 247,800 6,604.56 278.95	500, 18,0 579,0 37,340 1,892
PATIENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES							
REHEFICIARITS HI OF ACT DUTY SPONSOR IREE NI OF REI OR OEC SPONSOR R OF VISITS R OF NOT-VISIT SERVICES GOVERNMENT COST PATIENT COST GOVT AND PATIENT COST OVI COST PER VISIT	128 14 13 141 12,555 14,309 16,369	214 207 0 8 126 127 121,000 19,626 140,626 140,626	1.162 8023 358 3.586 3.027 252,346 91,016 343,362	926 521 151 255 1,393 443 148,158 79,853 228,011 106,36	678 (940) 57 185 4,567 4,567 297,513 96,049 393,562 395,164	498 359 499 3,004 2039 268,272 294,277 2772	1807 207 207 453
PATIENT CARE COST SHARED AS I							
BENEFICIARIES NT OF ACT DUTY SPONSOR IREL NT OF RET OR DEC SPONSOR GOVERNMENT COST PATIENT COST GOVI AND PATIENT COST	0 0 0 0 0	2 2 0 3 5 3 5 3 5	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	
TAL INPATIENT AND OUTPATIENT C	_	. 7.0		0.7.5		6.10	
BEHEFICIARIES NT OF ACT OUTY SPONSOR IRLE IT OF RET OR OEC SPONSOR GOVERNMENT COST PATIENT COST GOVE AND PATIENT COST REFER TO PAGE 1 ISPECIFICATION	128 111 4 13,870 13,870 18,179 IS PAGEJ OF TH	378 359 0 21 489,640 85,278 574,218 IS REPORT FOR	1,183 818 3 355,804 126,198 482,102 CLARIFICATION	930 9224 151 256 167,575 92,332 25,907 OF THE DATA HHID	710 457 64 194 788,564 146,289 934,853 CIL APPEARS ON	528 375 100 100 450,599 91,481 542,080 THIS REPORT.	/96,8 39,6 780,1

HR085-007 (OHRJ6Q) RUN DATE: 29 JAN 1991 RUN TIME: 16:20:07 MODE: 78,BENE ZIP

CHAMPUS HEALTH CARE SUMMARY BY PRIMARY DIAGNOSIS BASED ON CARE RECEIVED FROM OCT 1989 THRU SEP 1990 023 - HAYS AH FT ORD, CA

COLLECTION PERIOD:

I IMPATIENT HOSPITAL SERVICES AND THROUGH SUNGERY ORTHOPEOICS TURGERY UROLOGY CATEGORY ORTHOPEOICS TURGERY UROLOGY CATEGOR	MODE: 7B, BENE ZIP		* CATECORY OF	CARE - SURGE	DV ***********	*********	********	100F10
USER BEHETICIARIES 1	**************************************					HORACIC URGERY	UROLOGY	GRAND FOR A CATEGO
USER REPIEFICIARIES USER DEPTH OF RACT DUTY SPONSOR 1	USER BENEFICIARIES DEPNT OF ACT DUTY SPONSOR RETIREE DEFNT OF RET OR DEC SPONSOR 107AL HOSPITAL ADMISSIONS HUSPITAL DAYS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY (DAYS) AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY (DAYS) 101AL GOVERNMENT COST 101AL PATIENT COST 101AL GOVT AND PATIENT COST AVG GOVT COST PER ADMISSION AVG GOVT COST PER DAY	9,864 1,863.80 1,331.29	421-150-8-6-7-9-7-6-7-8-7-6-7-8-8-7-7-6-8-8-7-7-6-7-8-8-7-7-6-7-8-8-7-7-6-7-8-7-8	8 67 22 1645 7.455	37 20 138 6.90 83,587 192,687		7.331713880 7.40.685.880 19.585.890 2.685.890 2.685.890	3 , <u>1</u>
RETAIL R			9.7	29	£1	11	7.0	
USER BENEFICIARIES DEPNI DE ACT DUTY SPONSOR DE ACT DUTY SERVICES DE ACT D	DEPIT OF ACT DUTY SPONSOR RETIRES DEPNT OF RET OR DEC SPONSOR NUMBER OF VISITS NUMBER OF NON-VISIT SERVICES TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST TOTAL PATIENT COST TOTAL BOYL AND PATIENT COST	1 20 20 9,807 2,250	45 222 1823 6210 63,146	9 122 384 63,200	19 19 439 76,600	1 4 6 37 27 9,208 1,957	18 100 1478 1917 18,7243	1,7
DEPHT OF RET OR BEC SPONSOR 101AL COVERHIENT COST 101AL PATIENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES 101AL PATIENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES 101AL PATIENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES 101AL PATIENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES 101AL PATIENT OF ACT DUTY SPONSOR 101AL PATIENT OF ACT DUTY SPONSOR 101AL PATIENT COST 101AL PATIENT CO								
1.228		19,126 12,126	470,299 78,023 548,322	13 10 230,960 67,346 298,306	20 16D,D11 65,187 225,198	35,261 40,162	20 10 10 38,537 22,143 60,680	4,9 5 ₃
The property of the property								
V OUTPATIENT CARE COST SHARED AS INPATIENT U'ER BEHEFTCIARIES 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	PETUL OF ACT DUTY SPOUSOR	2,544 5722 5,740 5,740 341,729 775,585	1,274 188 2,273 2,531 355,487 495,441	58 38 896 4,763 210,020 219,387 259,487	5345 576792 5027 5027 5027 727	49 100 109 169 169 169 169 169 169 186 186 186 186 186 186 186 186 186 186	110 253 1,516 2,197 355,526 98,203	4 , i
RETURE RETURN DEC SPONSOR 0		INPATIENT						
UPER BENEFICIARIES 3,050 2,016 171 2,157 27 1,241		0 0 0 0 0	0 D 0	0 0 0	0 D D		0 0 0 0 0	
USER BEHEFICIARIES 3,050 2,016 171 2,157 27 1,241 DEPMT OF ACT DUTY SPONSOR 2,534 1,305 61 1,231 4 873 RETIREE DEPMT OF RET OR DEC SPONSOR 375 198 45 283 11 113 DEPMT OF RET OR DEC SPONSOR 375 198 45 283 11 113 DEPMT OF RET OR DEC SPONSOR 375 101AL GOVERNMENT COST 363,355 825,786 440,980 664,515 51,970 394,063 9.000 TOTAL PATIENT COST 76,351 217,978 116,733 288,522 24,454 120,346 24,701 GOVERNMENT COST 76,351 10,4376 10,4376 10,4376 10,4376 10,4376 10,4376 10,4376 10,4376 10,4376 10,4376 10,4376 11,600 11,60		CARE						
	USER BEHEFICIARIES DEPHT OF ACT DUTY SPONSOR RETIREE DEPHT OF RET OR DEC SPONSOR DEPHT OF RET OR DEC SPONSOR TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST TOTAL GOVERNMENT COST TOTAL GOVERN AND PATIENT COST HOLE: REFER TO PAGE 1 (SPECIFICATION	3,050 2,154 375 363,355 76,3551 439,706 NS PAGE) OF THI	2,016 1,305 198 514 825,786 217,978 1,043,764 S REPORT FOR	45 65 440,980	2,157 1,2835 644,5527 664,5527 0F THE DATA WHICH	51,970	113 256 394,063	2,2 11,6

APPENDIX I

SUMMARY OF COSTS/WORKLOAD

	Total Exp	OBD's			Cost Per Admiss.	ALOS
MEPRS	2449541	4844	505.69	1628	1504.63	3.0
CHAMPU	s 314365	272	1155.75	98	3207.80	2.77

APPENDIX J

INPATIENT SPECIALTY

FORT ORD ARMY HOSPITAL, FY 1990

UCA CODE	DESCRIPTION
AAAA	INTERNAL MEDICINE
AABA	CARDIOLOGY
AAFA	GASTROENTEROLOGY
AAHA	INTENSIVE CARE MICU
AAJA	NEUROLOGY
ABAA	GENERAL SURGERY
ABCA	INTENSIVE CARE SICU
ABEA	OPTHALMOLOGY
ABFA	ORAL SURGERY
ABGA	OTORHINOLARYNGOLOGY
ABKA	UROLOGY
ACAA	GYNECOLOGY
ACBA	OBSTETRICS
ADAA	PEDIATRICS
ADBA	NURSERY
AEAA	ORTHOPEDICS
AEBA	PODIATRY
AFAA	PSYCHIATRY

APPENDIX K (GLOSSARY)

- 2. DoD Department of Defense
- 3. ALOS Average Length of Stay
- 4. FY Fiscal Year
- 5. OBD Occupied Bed Day
- 6. NAS Non Availability Statement
- 7. CHAMPUS Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services
- 8. DEERS Defense Eligibility and Enrollment Reporting System
- 9. MEPRS Medical Expense and Performance Reporting System

LIST OF REFERENCES

- 1. Office of Civilian Health and Medical Program for the Uniformed Services (OCHAMPUS), CHAMPUS Handbook, Aurora, Colorado, July 1990.
- 2. Office of Civilian Health and Medical Program for the Uniformed Services (OCHAMPUS), CHAMPUS Chartbook of Statistics, Aurora, Colorado, August 1990.
- 3. Rand Corporation Report N-2647-HA, <u>Plan for an Evaluation of the CHAMPUS Reform Initiative</u>, by Hosek, S.D., and others, July 1987.
- 4. Willis, G., "Scarcer Resources May Create Pay, Benifits, PCS Problems," Navy Times, 05 April 1991.
- 5. Nelson, S.S., "New Managed Medical Plan Sign Up or B e Penalized," Navy Times, 29 April 1991.
- 6. Office of the Director Palo Alto Veterans Medical Center UNCLASSIFIED Letter 640/11C to Monterey County Veterans Services, Subj: Veterans Eligibility Veterans Health Care Amendment 99-272, June 6, 1990.
- 7. Delta Dental Plan of California (DDP*DELTA), <u>Summary Plan</u>
 <u>Description Booklet</u>, Sacramento, California, August 1990.
- 8. Center for Naval Analyses Report CRM 89-257, Comparing MTF and CHAMPUS Costs Using Patient Treatment Protocols, by May, L.J., and others, February 1990.
- 9. Rand Corporation Report N-3069-HA, <u>Preliminary Results</u> from an Evaluation of the CHAMPUS Reform Initiative, by Hosek, S.D., and others, January 1990.
- 10. Center for Naval Analyses Report CRM 90-7, <u>Estimating the Cost Effectiveness of Recapturing CHAMPUS Workload</u>, by Laurie J. May, May 1990.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1.	Defense Technical Information Center Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22304-6145	2
2.	Library, Code 52 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943-5002	2
3.	Dr. Dan Trietsch Code AS/TR Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943-5002	1
4.	LCDR Ken Steiner, USN Code AS/ST Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943-5002	1
5.	Commanding Officer Health Sciences Education and Training Command, Code MSC-2 National Naval Medical Center Bethesda, Maryland 20814-5022	1
6.	USA MEDDAC Attn:Mr. Terry Williams HSXT-RMD Silas B. Hays Army Hospital Fort Ord, California 93941	1
7.	LT Julito P. Laluan, MSC, USNR 4927 Springwood Circle Fairfield, California 94585	1











to the same of the

Thesis L24645 Laluan c.1 Milit

system.

Military health care

